EURIPIDES' BACCHAE
THE PLAY
AND ITS AUDIENCE

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

A. D. LEEMAN · H. W. PLEKET · C. J. RUIJGH

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM SEPTUAGESIMUM OCTAVUM

HANS ORANJE

EURIPIDES' BACCHAE
THE PLAY
AND ITS AUDIENCE

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL MCMLXXXIV

EURIPIDES' BACCHAE
THE PLAY AND ITS AUDIENCE

BY

HANS ORANJE

LEIDEN E. J. BRILL 1984

The publication of this book has been made possible by a grant from the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.)

ISBN 90 04 07011 7

Copyright 1984 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E. J. BRILL

CONTENTS

Preface vii

I. Introduction: the riddle of the *Bacchae* 1
II. The interpretation of the *Bacchae* 7
III. The audience response 20
IV. Pentheus (1)—*Bacchae* 1-656 34
V. Pentheus (2)—*Bacchae* 657-1392 72

Dionysus. Introduction to Chapters Six, Seven and Eight 99

VI. Dionysus (1): the god in the life of the Athenians 101
VII. Dionysus (2): the god on the tragic stage 114
VIII. Dionysus (3): the god's epiphanies in the *Bacchae* 131
IX. Space and action in the *Bacchae* 143
X. The chorus in the action: what is wisdom? 156
XI. Conceptual meanings 167

Appendix 1: Bernd Seidensticker's study of the Pentheus character 176
Appendix 2: *Bacchae* 651-2 178
Appendix 3: *Bacchae* 748-68 181
Appendix 4: *Bacchae* 135-69 187

Bibliography 192

Indexes 199

PREFACE

This study of the *Bacchae* was originally a doctoral thesis prepared at the Free University of Amsterdam. I owe much to the encouragement and helpful advice given to me by the Chairman of the Greek Department, Professor D. M. Schenkeveld.

Between 1980 and 1982 the book was translated into English by Mr. W. A. Weir of Hull, Great Britain. I thank both him and his Dutch wife for their patience and understanding, and I keep grateful memories of our meetings in England and Holland, when we discussed the translation.

I have not been able to take full account of the books and articles about the *Bacchae* which appeared after 1980. Only in a few cases have I added some lines to my text, when it seemed to be of real importance to clarify my point. The new Teubner edition of the *Bacchae* by E. Chr. Kopff (Leipzig 1982) came too late for me to discuss the editor's views.

Greek words and phrases in the main text have been translated throughout (a few exceptions have been made). In doing so I hope that the book will also be of value to the student of ancient drama who has no Greek.

Many scholars in this country have offered helpful comments on my book. I wish to thank them all. I should like to express my special indebtedness to Professor J. M. Bremer and to Dr. S. R. Slings. Both of them suggested considerable improvements. The faults remain my own.

AMSTERDAM H.O.
April 1984

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: THE RIDDLE OF THE *BACCHAE*

'Euripides says so many things in this play'.
T. B. L. Webster, *Tragedies of Euripides*, 276

Pier Paolo Pasolini, the Italian poet, writer and cineast, who lived from 1922 to 1975, was particularly influenced in his work by Greek tragedy.[1] In *Teorema*, one of the most difficult of his films to understand, he stages a dramatic situation which appears to be a reflection of Euripides' *Bacchae*.[2] An unknown, silent visitor comes one day into a wealthy bourgeois family (the father is a Milan industrialist), and arouses in the whole family, father, mother, son, daughter, and their maid, an erotic desire which leads each one of them to a psychological crisis. The visitor leaves as suddenly as he appeared, but their love for him caused a radical change in those he leaves behind. The maid, Emilia, who represents the peasant proletariat, returns to her birthplace, where she becomes a saint and works miracles; she is buried alive, but her tears continue to flow and become a spring. The bourgeois characters too are transformed: the daughter lies perpetually paralysed in bed; the son becomes an abstract painter, but realizes his failure and at the end of the film urinates against his paintings. Lucia, the mother, drives in her car along the pavements of the Milan streets, looking for young men for whom she can be a whore, while the father gives his factory to his workers, and in the last sequence of the film, surrounded by the crowds in Milan station, he strips, runs outsided, and, naked, climbs the bare, smoking heights of a volcano.

The first and most interesting correspondence between the *Bacchae* and *Teorema* is probably the background of ideas behind the dramatic conflict. However many different and widely divergent interpretations have been published about Euripides' intention with the *Bacchae*, it is impossible in

---

[1] Pasolini made two cinematographic interpretations of Greek tragedy: *Edipo Re* (1967) and *Medea* (1969). He also translated, and wished to film, Aeschylus *Oresteia*, transposed to modern Africa. He never achieved this, but there is a documentary account of his preparations produced on 16 mm film: *Appunti per un Orestiade Africana* (1969).

[2] 1968, with Giuseppe Ruzzolini (camera), Nino Basagli (montage), Franco Rossellini and Manolo Bolognini (production), Aetos Films, Rome, 35 mm., black/white and colour, 98 minutes. Pasolini first intended Teorema to be a tragedy written in verse, but he changed his mind about this. In its place he published a novel, *Teorema,* Milan 1968. He made the film from the novel.

such interpretations to avoid dealing with the concepts of wisdom, cleverness and soundness of mind, which occur frequently in the play. Time and again the chorus' declaration in line 395: 'cleverness is not wisdom,' appears crucial for the interpretation; by it the chorus possibly mean that man's capacity to rationalize drives him away from insight into the human condition, for which he must have the irrational acceptance of Dionysus. 'Thus it is true that the god of wine lays bare the emotional nature, the fundamental passions of men, Eros in its deepest and its widest sense, and in a sense therefore Dionysus may be taken as a symbol of those passions. Recognize them as a necessary and welcome element in human life, allow them to live in you and with you; they will give you loveliness and joy. Ignore them, and they will conquer you as they did Agave, and become themselves ugly in the process. Deny them altogether, fight them, proclaim that they do not exist, and they will tear you limb from limb like Pentheus. And in that process the god has in truth become a fiend'.[3] In these lines of Grube's—just as in his later views about the play[4]—the thought is implicit that this is the message or the moral of Euripides' *Bacchae.* One of the questions which this study seeks to answer is whether or not this is so.

In Pasolini's *Teorema* we are confronted with a conflict that is comparable with the vision of the *Bacchae* formulated by Grube. Rational bourgeois thinking is pitted against the irrational acceptance of what Pasolini calls 'metaphysics', 'authenticity', 'the ancient feeling for holiness', what in Marxist terms is called 'metahistory' and Catholic terms 'mysticism'.[5] This authenticity is embodied (a second parallel with the *Bacchae*) in the figure of a stranger, a visitor, who—and in view of the ambiguity of the word σοφός: 'wise', 'clever', in the *Bacchae* this is a relevant complication for us in the conflict—is not the exact counterpart of a member of modern capitalist society. 'Ce personnage est devenu ambigu, à mi-chemin entre l'angélique et le démoniaque. Le visiteur est beau, il est bon, mais il a aussi quelque chose de vulgaire (car c'est un bourgeois lui aussi). Il n'existe pas de bourgeois non cultivé qui ne soit pas vulgaire; car seule la culture peut purifier. Il y a en lui cet élément de vulgarité qu'il a accepté d'avoir pour descendre parmi ces bourgeois. Il est donc ambigu. Ce qui est authentique par contre, c'est l'amour qu'il suscite parce que c'est un amour sans compromis, un amour hors des compromis avec la vie, un amour qui provoque le scandale, un amour qui détruit, qui modifie l'idée que le bourgeois se fait de lui-même; l'authen-

---

[3] G. M. A. Grube, *Dionysus in the Bacchae*, TAPhA 66 (1935) 54.
[4] *The Drama of Euripides* (1941) 419.
[5] Pasolini in an interview with *Jeune Cinéma* 33 (October 1968) 7-8.

tique, c'est donc l'amour, et la cause de l'amour, c'est ce personnage ambigu.'[6]

Thirdly, in *Teorema* a dividing line is drawn between the maid Emilia and her bourgeois employers. Emilia still possesses an element of the preindustrial, peasant consciousness of the divine, from which the urban bourgeoisie, the French even more than the Italian, is estranged by industry.[7] 'La servante...est la seule capable de miracle, parce qu'étant le peuple, elle n'est pas entièrement coupée de la réalité.[8] Perhaps this contrast between the urban bourgeoisie and the rural subproletariat in modern Italy, is comparable to the contrast between the common sense of Cadmus' daughters and grandson, that tells them that the Dionysus who was born of Semele cannot be a god (26-31, 242-47), compared with the intuitive perception of the reality by the shepherd on Cithaeron (664 ff.).[9]

These correspondences between the *Bacchae* and *Teorema* are based, so far as the *Bacchae* is concerned, on an interpretation of the play that possibly does not adequately reproduce Euripides' intention. After all, 'the riddle of the *Bacchae*', as this problem has been called since the appearance of a study under this title by Gilbert Norwood,[10] is one of the best known problems of Greek tragedy. In the last resort the question is: what was Euripides' intention with this play? More concretely, from what concept did the poet start, when he created the dramatic conflict of this tragedy? Grube's statement, quoted above, which is strongly reminiscent of the possible purport of *Teorema*, is only one of the many ways of looking at the *Bacchae*. If the supposition is correct, that in *Teorema* Pasolini allowed himself to be inspired by the *Bacchae*, his film is an illustration of how far the dramatic conflict of the *Bacchae*, as conceived by Grube and others, speaks to the imagination of our own age.

But, just as was the case with Norwood's interpretation, so Grube's, confirmed and developed by others, has aroused opposition. Obviously the *Bacchae* does not leave its readers satisfied with past interpretations of

---

[6] Interview with Lino Peroni, *Inquadratura* (summer 1968, Pavia), here quoted from the French version in *Jeune Cinéma* 33 (October 1968) 12.

[7] *Jeune Cinéma* 1.1.8: '...le trait qui caractérise la bourgeoisie, c'est la raison; une raison qui, à la limite, tombe dans le simple sens pratique, le bon sens vulgaire'.

[8] Pasolini in *La Quinzaine Littéraire* 68 (1 March 1969). As a marxist Pasolini received much criticism for it, see Pascal Bonitzer (*Cahiers du Cinéma* 211 (April 1969) 53): 'Que peut nous dire une "parabole" séparée, suspendue en l'air, telle la servante en question, sans contradictions, sans preuves, sans conflit dialectique? Qu'a de marxiste une telle parabole?'

[9] Compare too the contrast between the urban rationalist, and the countryman susceptible to the supernatural, *Ba.* 717, *IT* 275-80.

[10] *The Riddle of the Bacchae* (University of Manchester Publications xxxi), Manchester 1908.

the play, but continually provokes them to try to discover the intention of the poet in this last of his plays.

This intention, or conception, of the poet, given that it is present in a sense that goes beyond writing a good tragedy, and that it reveals a view, or opinion, about reality outside the theatre, can only be known through the medium the poet was using: his play. This play had nonetheless been written by him with an eye to performance for an audience. The audience takes cognisance of a play through following its dramatic action on the stage, that is to say: in a period of two hours they experience an occurrence which has a very complex significance for them. In the course of the action which they see, they receive a series of items of information about the development of the plot, and about the characters of the dramatis personae; according to the nature of the happenings on the stage, they undergo feelings of joy and grief; in the reality of the theatre they are confronted by their own reality, and in the end they are perhaps invited, on the basis of the action, to make a value-judgement about the fictional reality of the play, and at the same time about their own reality. All the meanings which have to be given to the action are woven by the audience, during and after the performance of the play, into one whole dramatic experience—a whole to which the poet directed his dramatic composition.

Therefore an attempt will be made to study this whole dramatic experience—called 'audience response'—from the various aspects outlined above. For the audience[11] the question about the conception, the judgement that the poet implicitly declares about the action which he has created, is only one part of the whole dramatic experience. This one part will not be discussed until the last chapter, since it is perhaps the most fundamental, but certainly the most difficult part of their experience to retrieve. Nevertheless it is important to appreciate that in discussing the audience response one cannot avoid enquiring into the justification for the appearance of the character of Dionysus in the action of the *Bacchae*; I do not believe that one can beg this question by arguing that Dionysus is a great and powerful god, whose actions fall outside the spectator's moral code, and whose actions the spectator accepts, because he experiences them as a natural, instinctive force.[12] Moreover, if one believes—perhaps

[11] It cannot be doubted that Euripides when writing the *Bacchae* had in mind a forthcoming production in Athens, and not one for his Macedonian hosts in Pella, cf. Dodds *Introd.* xl.

[12] The distinction between the actions of the god as a character on the tragic stage and everything that the god represents (or, if preferred, of which he is a symbol) was not made by, for example, Kitto. He is therefore wrong to remark (*Greek Tragedy* 375): 'Did Euripides approve or disapprove of Dionysus? The question is silly, as silly as to ask whether he approved or disapproved of Aphrodite'.

rightly—that for the Greeks Dionysus is a 'non-moral and especially non-rational god',[13] one is faced in the *Bacchae* with a god who in the shape of a mortal takes part in mortal acts. The Athenian of the fifth century might not in his daily life go so far as the idea of calling the god to account for his deeds as related in the myth, and might take part in the rites without worrying his head about the god's morality; but this Athenian, confronted as he was with a character portrayed by a Dionysus actor, just as he was with a character portrayed by a Pentheus actor, might well during a performance of the *Bacchae* form a belief about the morality of Dionysus' actions.[14]

For an examination of audience response to the *Bacchae* we have as our principle data the text of the play. This text has lacunae; the stage practice within which this text was performed is not known to us in all its detail; about the personal ideas of the author we know precisely nothing that has not been deduced in the first place from his dramatic work. Although therefore we have many problems, it is not perhaps just the distance in time which separates us from the time of origin of the *Bacchae* that is an obstacle in our attempt, by describing the audience response, to obtain a clearer picture of all Euripides' intentions in his play. Again Pasolini's *Teorema* offers an illustration. In the case of Pasolini we have at our disposal the text of a novel; we have the film, which frame by frame contains what Pasolini wants us to see and hear; the film is made with an eye to us, the author's contemporaries; we are informed about the author's personal views, not only by his cinematographic and his literary work, but by Pasolini's own essays, and by interviews with him. Even so it appears that the film has aroused completely conflicting reactions.[15] There is a dossier of Pasolini, compiled after his death, which contains an attempt to summarize the essential character of the film. This summary is hardly more explicit than that which Dodds gives of the Bacchae (*Introd.* p. xlvii): 'It is a mistake to ask what he [Euripides] is trying to "prove": his concern in this as in all his major plays is not to prove anything but to enlarge our sensibility'. The 'essential character' of *Teorema* reads: 'En fait, *Theorème* traduit la quête d'un intellectuel craig-

[13] Kitto, op. cit., 377.

[14] In *Teorema* too we see that the stranger, who possesses one genuine quality, a love which is free of compromise, is at the same time a man of flesh and blood; during his stay with the family he reads Rimbaud, the representative of 'French bourgeoisie in an irrational phase of their decadence' (Pasolini in his interview with *Jeune Cinéma* 33, p. 8).

[15] The international Catholic film bureau O.C.I.C. gave the film an award at Venice, but on the intervention of the Vatican the showing of the film was banned. Pasolini was charged with obscenity; the sentence demanded was six months imprisonment and destruction of the film; the verdict was an acquittal. Pasolini was also attacked from the marxist side.

nant de voir l'homme se limiter à la seule intelligence et cherchant d'autres formes de contacts humains dans lesquels les sens, le cœur et le sexe ne seraient pas sacrifiés au cerveau'.[16] Although we are fully enlightened about the background of Pasolini's 'mythical marxism',[17] *Teorema* has remained a film that is difficult to understand, because the dramatic conflict obviously submits to no solution, but develops into a parody, as much in the miracles of Emilia (the saintly but still animal plebeian) as in the destruction of the superior bourgeoisie.[18] It may be suggested that the insolubility of the conflict can be ascribed to the disharmony in Pasolini himself; a disharmony which can be inferred from all his work: '...mit immer neuen Mitteln wird das Leben des pasolinischen, vorindustriellen Proletariats geschildert, ein Volk, das Erlösung und Menschlichkeit verheisst, ohne die Erlösung und Befreiung bringen zu können, denn der Kampf, das Bewusstsein und die Anwendung des Marxismus als Wissenschaft der Revolution würden ja notwendigerweise die animalische, heilige Reinheit und Glückseligkeit des Volkes zerstören'.[19] Whenever there is any question of a comparable dramatic conflict in the *Bacchae* and in *Teorema*, the resemblance can perhaps be traced back to the authors themselves, who, familiar as they were with contemporary methods of rationalist criticism (for Euripides the sophists, for Pasolini marxism), sought for a level on which rational thought could accommodate itself with man's irrational impulses.[20] It is possible that they both tried to demonstrate that there is no such level, but in this respect the *Bacchae* will perhaps remain just as inscrutable as *Teorema*.

The subject of the enquiry is now the *Bacchae*. Two introductory chapters precede this enquiry: a review of the opinions that, particularly recently, have been advanced about the *Bacchae* (chapter 2), and a formulation and explanation of the theoretical foundation underlying the study of the audience response (chapter 3).

---

[16] René Prédal, *Pier Paolo Pasolini 1922-1975* (Anthologie du Cinéma 91), L'Avant-Scene du Cinéma 175 (1 November 1976) 16.

[17] Cf. Peter Kammerer, *Der Traum vom Volk. Pasolinis mythischer Marxismus*, in: Hans-Klaus Jungheinrich..., *Pier Paolo Pasolini*, Reihe Film 12 (Hanser), München 1977, 13-34.

[18] Pasolini spoke of the parody in his treatment of Emilia at the end of the film in an interview with Jean Duflot (Paris 1970), reported in Reihe Hanser (see note 17) 87.

[19] Peter Kammerer, l.l. 25.

[20] Thus J. C. Kamerbeek supposes that the tragic material of the *Bacchae* reflects Euripides' own disharmony: 'The harmony of the *Bacchae* is an artistic paradox', *Euripides en het probleem der Bacchen*' in: *De Antieke Tragedie* (lectures, given at the conference on classical studies, 22-27 July 1946), Leiden 1947, p. 120.

CHAPTER TWO

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE *BACCHAE*[21]

In the history of the interpretation of the *Bacchae,* more interest was originally focussed on the god Dionysus than on his antagonist, Pentheus, king of Thebes. The interpretations also sought primarily for an answer to the question of what the poet's personal attitude was towards the god Dionysus, towards the myth, and towards the religious attitudes to life in which maenadism had its roots. The question of the motive for Pentheus' actions took only second place. To some extent this lesser interest is explained by the facts of the play itself, in which from the moment that he drove the Theban women into the mountains, the god holds the initiative of the action both on and off the stage (23 ff.). Pentheus' actions are above all a reaction to those of the god; and, depending upon the answer to the first question on Euripides' personal opinion about Dionysus, the second question, on the motive of Pentheus' actions, was often answered either in terms of atheism and criminal behaviour, or with a defence of his casting as the victim of religious terrorism. On the other hand this lesser interest in the character of Pentheus must also be ascribed to the opinion of many commentators that Pentheus is not the central character in the *Bacchae* and that the alternative title of *Pentheus* for the play is not original. 'We have the ordinary hot-tempered and narrow-minded tyrant—not very carefully studied, by the way, and apparently not very interesting to the poet'.[22] The role of Pentheus was, and is seen by many as, an inferior one in the play, in which Dionysus is the central figure, whose revalation, whose manifestation as a god, forms the overriding theme.[23] Pentheus' stubborn attitude is seen by A. Rivier as the resistance to the god 'de son adversaire le plus noble', since both the character of Pentheus and the motives of his resistance are noble. So in all its aspects the dramatic conflict glorifies divine omnipotence: 'On se

---

[21] Harald Merklin gives an historical summary of the interpretations in *Gott und Mensch im 'Hippolytos' und den 'Bakchen' des Euripides*, (diss.) Freiburg im Breisgau 1964, 30-39. I have dealt summarily with the period covered by Merklin; I have only gone into more detail than Merklin did in the case of Rivier's theory (n. 24), in view of his influence particularly on the French school of *Bacchae* criticism.

[22] Gilbert Murray, *Essays and Addresses*, London 1921, 79.

[23] Felix Wassermann, *Die Bakchantinnen des Euripides*, Neue Jahrb. für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung 5 (1929), 273.

convainc donc sans peine que le rôle de Penthée est composé de manière à rehausser l'image qui nous est donné de la grandeur du dieu'.[24]

The opposite view has been expressed in its most extreme form by A. W. Verrall and G. Norwood. They thought that the Dionysus of the *Bacchae* is not the god, but an impostor, the mortal prophet of a false religion, who brilliantly (but without scruples, and with ghastly cruelty, Norwood) forces Thebes to his will.[25] It is striking that Verrall's rationalist criticism not only comes to a conclusion that is diametrically opposed to that of Rivier about the stranger/Dionysus, but also about Pentheus. 'His whole sin, and it is enough, lies in *punishing upon a presumption*—the most intolerable use of authority' (p. 58). Verrall was reading a completely different tragedy to Rivier: 'Even the leader, detestable as upon the whole he is, proves himself an ardent and brave devotee, who, in the part of captive and martyr, confronts the oppressor with a dignity which compels our sympathy. His mildness, candour, and trust in an invisible protection contrast to great advantage with the petulance, prejudice, and violence of the King' (p. 145).

The many interpretations which have been made of the play are distributed between these two extremes. The identification of the stranger with the god has not been disputed again since Verrall, but even so the identity of the god with the stranger leads many critics again and again to the conclusion that in the *Bacchae*, as elsewhere in his work, Euripides is the rationalist protesting against the religious ideas of his time. E. Bruhn had already expressed it as follows (*Einleitung* 24): 'Also ist Euripides den Anschauungen, welche er als Mann vertreten hatte, als Greis treu geblieben. Wie er so oft in dem Rahmen des Kunstwerks gegen eben den Stoff protestiert hatte, den er künstlerisch darstellen musste, so hat er es auch hier gethan. Aber freilich, er war ein Greis und des Kampfes müde; so ist der Ton, in dem er seinen Widerspruch erhebt, ein anderer geworden'. However, in this school of protest, of dissent, Pentheus too gains more sympathy than Verrall had for him.[26] Paul Masqueray gave an almost entirely favourable view of the Pentheus character;[27] such was also the opinion of Max Pohlenz: 'Liebenswert,

[24] André Rivier, *Essai sur le tragique d'Euripide*. Lausanne 1944, here quoted from ²Paris 1975, 81f.

[25] Gilbert Norwood (cf. n. 10) retracted his suggestion in *Essays on Euripidean Drama*, London 1954, 52-73. A. W. Verrall, *The Bacchants of Euripides and other Essays*, Cambridge 1910, 1-163.

[26] Norwood, too, held different opinions from Verrall about the character of Pentheus, cf. *The Riddle of the Bacchae* 66: 'Pentheus, in short, far from being the villain of the play, is the finest character in it'; p. 67: 'Arrogant he is, and impulsive, but most would rather lie beside his mangled body at the end than share the thoughts of the believers who stand around it'.

[27] *Euripide et ses idées*, Paris 1908, 144ff.

Gegenstand unseres Mitleids bleibt er bis zum letzten Augenblick'.[28] K. Deichgräber[29] agreed with Masqueray's opinion: 'Pentheus zunächst subjektiv nich schuldig' (p. 337 n. 3) and his analysis of the scene between Cadmus and Teiresias brings him to a conclusion that is remarkable in the history of the play's interpretations, namely that the attention of Euripides is concentrated on the inward workings of the Pentheus character. Referring to the parallel myths about Lycurgus and others, Deichgräber remarks (p. 348): 'Bei Euripides ist zwar Pentheus wieder der Besiegte, Dionysos der Sieger, aber diese Festellung gilt doch nur in einem rein äusserlichen Sinn. Euripides' Bakchen sind in Wirklichkeit die Tragödie eines Menschen, der in dieser Umgebung, wenn ihm ein Gegner wie Dionysos gegenübersteht, untergehen *muss*, der aber als Mensch gesehen und beurteilt im hohen Grade Teilnahme und Mitleid erweckt. Diese Verlegung des Akzents auf das Menschliche, darin steckt der ganze Euripides'.

The idea that Euripides is registering a protest against (the representation of) a god who imposes his will on men in such a way has remained a hot potato in Bacchae criticism. It once drew from A. Lesky the irritable comment: 'Noch immer gibt es Stimmen, die in diesem Drama den protestierenden Rationalisten vernehmen wollen. Es wäre an der Zeit, eine Deutung endgültig aufzugeben, die vor der Glut und Tiefe, mit der hier ein religiöses Phänomen geschildert ist, nicht standhalten kann'.[30] Lesky at that time also rejected the palinode theory as being selfevidently incorrect, but it is worth noting that at the same time referred to Rivier as if agreeing with him. Rivier must properly be considered a supporter of the palinode theory in *Bacchae* criticism, witness his statement about the *Bacchae* (p. 192): 'Cette pièce dénote une assurance quasi prophétique qui fait songer à Éschyle; elle interroge beaucoup moins qu'elle n'affirme; elle est marquée, quant aux dieux, d'un accent de certitude dont le sens, à considérer l'incertitude qui règne ailleurs, me paraît assez clair. Je crois en verité que si le poète avait atteint le but auquel tendaient ses efforts et qu'il eût *vu* enfin ce qu'il distinguait très mal auparavant, les *Bacchantes* ne seraient pas différentes de ce qu'elles sont'. In a comprehensive note Rivier makes his position clear on the view of the *Bacchae* which had

---

[28] *Die griechische Tragödie*, Leipzig 1930; here quoted from ²Göttingen 1954, 455.

[29] Karl Deichgräber, *Die Kadmos-Teiresiasszene in Euripides' Bakchen.* Hermes 70 (1935) 322-349.

[30] Albin Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, ¹Göttingen 1956, 200. In later editions Lesky no longer included this statement, and had obviously reached a different opinion about the *Bacchae.* He comments there particularly on the two environments of Pentheus and of Dionysus, ³1972, p. 499: 'Euripides ist weder Pentheus noch dionysischer Myste ... er trägt sie als lebensbestimmende Mächte in seinem eigenen Inneren'. Cf. J. C. Kamerbeek, quoted in note 20.

gained great importance with Murray, Pohlenz, and Dodds[31] (p. 192 n.1): 'Or les critiques que j'ai cités estiment tous que la pensée sous-jacente d'Euripide contredit les intentions que la forme de son drame nous invite à lui attribuer: cette pensée serait rationaliste, elle tendrait à présenter Dionysos sous le jour le plus défavorable. De là vient que ces auteurs discernent dans les *Bacchantes* la présence d'une discordance, d'une opposition radicale entre la "forme" et le "fond" de la tragédie. Mais cette opposition est incompatible avec les lois de toute création poétique. S'il fallait en croire nos critiques, cette pièce serait d'une médiocrité achevée. ... Le sang répandu par Dionysos dans les *Bacchantes* n'appelle pas la réprobation morale; il suscite l'effroi sacré. Il ne parle pas contre les "mœurs" du dieu; il exalte sa mystérieuse et terrifiante puissance. Ainsi la discordance aiguë, la contradiction qui arrête encore tant de bons esprits est en fait résolue. Comme dans le chapitre 38 du livre de *Job*, l'homme, partagé d'abord entre la révolte et l'acceptation méprisante, s'abîme enfin dans la crainte et le tremblement religieux'.

These are the most opposed views about the *Bacchae*: on the one hand that the play portrays maenadism as the manifestation of religious fanaticism, by which reason is destroyed, a fanaticism against which the poet protests; on the other, that the play portrays it as the manifestation of a divine power, which defines the dimensions of human existence, a power which the poet accepts with deep piety. An important contribution towards bridging this gap was provided by E. R. Dodds, G.M.A. Grube, and R. P. Winnington-Ingram.[32] In 1929 Dodds pointed out that Euripides must be called an 'irrationalist', if we understand by rationalism the philosophy of life, which makes three affirmations: (i) reason (λόγος) is the only instrument for recognising truth, (ii) reason is the essential character of reality, (iii) reason not only determines facts, but also values. Now, plays like *Medea* and *Hippolytus* show clearly that Euripides denies the supremacy of reason in human existence: soundness of mind (σωφροσύνη) does not guarantee that a man will make the right choices, but irrational, ruthless forces direct his way through life, and are stronger than he is himself. Mythified, they are called Aphrodite, Artemis, or Dionysus. Grube went further along the road that Dodds had shown: in the *Bacchae* the god stands for the fundamental passions in man. The key to a good understanding of the tragedy is supplied by the development of the god's character: 'the Dionysiac in man becoming evil and fiendish when denied and suppressed' (1935, p. 37). Dodds in his

---

[31] Rivier is not referring to Dodd's commentary, but to his *Maenadism in the Bacchae.*

[32] In chronological sequence: E. R. Dodds, *Euripides the Irrationalist*, 1929; G. M. A. Grube, *Dionysus in the Bacchae*, 1935; id., *The Drama of Euripides*, 1941; Dodds, *Introd. and Commentary*, 1944; R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus*, 1948.

commentary on the *Bacchae* came up with a concrete psychology for Pentheus, which conformed to the earlier ideas of Zielinski and Wilamowitz.[33] Dodds considered that there is an element in Pentheus' character that is decisive for the tragic end of the theomachist, the Dionysiac longing in himself (*Comm.* p. 172). Pentheus is 'the dark puritan whose passion is compounded of horror and unconscious desire, and it is this which leads him to his ruin' (ad 222-23). This view was further extended and made into the kernel of the dramatic conflict by R. P. Winnington-Ingram. The essence of this kernel is that Winnington-Ingram distinguished two Dionysiac tendencies in Pentheus: one of fascination with the sensual aspects of the god, and beside it, a lust for power, which is equally the source of Dionysiac frenzy (p. 54). 'In Pentheus reside the same explosive forces of blind emotionalism that are in his opponents' (p. 55); when maenadism triumphs, and Pentheus is destroyed, this happens because the maenads operate as a group and he goes to work in isolation. After all, 'a solitary Bacchanal is anomalous, incomplete: to the perfection of Dionysiac technique the group is essential'. So Winnington-Ingram arrives at this picture of the Pentheus character (p. 58): 'He thinks he is rational and prudent, but really, like them, he is at the mercy of irrational impulse, and, like them, he expresses himself through violence. But in his isolation he is no match for them. No force that he commands can compete with theirs, while his unrealised sexual impulses and the lust for power—traitors within his own heart—will deliver him, bound and helpless, into the hands of his enemies'.

Against Dodds' thesis, and above all against Winnington-Ingram's, objections were raised by Hans Diller.[34] Diller recognized that the psychological approach to Pentheus by, among others, Wilamowitz and Dodds had rightly originated in the fact that the god finally defeats Pentheus not by external means, but by Pentheus' own internal make-up (p. 477 f.). But this does not mean that the *motive* for Pentheus' choosing to oppose the god also has a Dionysiac origin; this would turn the assumptions of the play inside out, and make the theomachist into a 'misratener Anhänger'. Diller agrees with Dodds' characterization of the Pentheus

---

[33] Th. Zielinski, quoted by Dodds, *Introd.* xliii, n. 3. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Tragödien*, übersetzt von —, Bd. IV (Berlin 1923) 142-3: 'Er [Euripides] weiss vom Leben, was er sieht und einsieht, und könnte mit Menander sagen, dass der Gott, der den Menschen und sein Geschick bestimmt, seine individuelle Natur ist. ... Auch hier ist der Gott, der den Pentheus in Wahrheit ins Verderben treibt, in ihm, sein Dünkel, seine Hoffart, seine Eitelkeit, Haltlosigkeit, selbst Lüsternheit. An diesen Schwächen packt ihn der Verführer und zieht ihn ins Verderben. Es ist keine andere Psychologie als in der Medea'.

[34] Hans Diller, *Die Bakchen und ihre Stellung im Spätwerk des Euripides*, 1955.

role as a typical tragedy tyrant, and he states (p. 480): 'Wir kommen mit der gewöhnlichsten Tyrannenpsychologie aus, wenn wir feststellen, dass es für ihn unerträglich sein muss, in seiner Stadt eine fremde Macht zuzulassen, die evident einen stärkeren Einfluss auf die Menschen ausübt als er selbst'.

The crucial passage for the problem of Pentheus' psychology is, as is well known, the reversal in his relationship with the stranger from 812 on. Diller rejects, on the grounds of his 'motivation criticism', the opinion that Pentheus accepts the stranger's offer as an 'Ausfluss einer verderbten Phantasie und einer von Verdrängungen gespeisten Lüsternheit'—no, 'Pentheus will wirklich mit seinem Erkundungsgang etwas erfahren—, allerdings etwas, das seine vorgefasste Meinung bestätigen soll (vgl. 814, 1060). Er will die Bakchen der Ausschweifung überführen, was ihm nach seiner Angabe betrüblich wäre, aber, wie Dionysos besser weiss, ihm angenehm geschähe (814 f.): damit wäre der verhasste Feind blossgestellt und moralisch vernichtet' (p. 485).

Harald Merklin (cf. n. 21), in his study of 1964, declared that he found Diller's assessment of the Pentheus role convincing (p. 133 n. 2), with the exception of the crucial point of how we must interpret the change in the relationship between Pentheus and Dionysus after 810. Pentheus is overpowered by the god from outside, in an abrupt reversal (p. 154); 850-51 argue convincingly against the idea that Pentheus is ruined by his own repressed Dionysiac impulses: (Dionysus:) 'First deprive him of his reason, and put in him light-headed madness'.[35] 'Warum soll Dionysos in dem Augenblick, wo sein Handeln auf die Vernichtung des Pentheus abzielt, erst psychologische Verführungskünste spielen lassen und dann, obwohl sein Opfer bereits ins Netz geht (V. 848), eine ganz neue Waffen einführen, die er vorher nicht gebraucht hätte?' (p. 155).

In a different way Rosenmeyer[36] rejected a psychological approach to the Pentheus role: 'The personal relations brought into play are devised chiefly as one of the means for the author to invoke his philosophical riddle. In the *Alcestis* character is all; in the *Bacchae* it counts for very little' (p. 164). The change in Pentheus is not a switch from one phase of life to another, still less a slide into sickness or perversion, but quite simply death. From 811 the role of the hero is ended, like that of Agamemnon in Aeschylus, as soon as he stepped on to the purple carpet: 'Instead of the corporeal death which will be set offstage, the audience watch the death of the soul. With Agamemnon slowly moving through the sea of red the

---

[35] πρῶτα δ' ἔκστησον φρενῶν, | ἐνεὶς ἐλαφρὰν λύσσαν.

[36] Thomas G. Rosenmeyer, *Tragedy and Religion: The Bacchae*, in: *The Masks of Tragedy*, Austin 1963, here quoted from Erich Segal, ed., Euripides, *A Collection of Critical Essays*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1968, 150-170.

contours are blurred and the king of all the Greeks is annihilated before our eyes. Aeschylus uses a splash; Euripides, less concretely but no less effectively, uses a change of personality' (p. 167).[37]

Ernst-Richard Schwinge[38] made a detailed contribution to the progress of the discussion. He held that Rosenmeyer and Merklin, the opponents of a psychological reversal in Pentheus after 812, were wrong;[39] he tried to remove Diller's 'sehr ernst zu nehmende Zweifel' by his analysis of the stichomythia in the *Bacchae*, in which he considered that a psychological explanation was the only one possible, but disassociated himself from Winnington-Ingram: 'Mir scheint der König weder (wie konsequenterweise Winnington-Ingram) im Grunde *nur* Bakchant zu sein noch aber auch (wie Diller) in sich gar nichts Dionysisches zu haben; seine Aversion gegen das Bakchantische hat durchaus Eigenwert und ist echt; doch zugleich besitzt Pentheus eine ausgeprägte Affinität zu diesem Bereich, ist er vom Dionysischen fasziniert, und von Sehnsucht zu ihm erfüllt. Erst beides zusammen macht sein Wesen aus, und weil das so ist, handelt er, wie er auch handelt—ob dagegen ob dafür—, übersteigert und überhitzt' (p. 380-81).

In the criticism of the *Bacchae*, outlined above, different trends of thought are apparent about the psychological problems of the Pentheus character. The main trend is that which accepts the interpretation of Grube and Dodds; Pentheus is a typical tragedy tyrant, with a strong Dionysiac longing in himself. In recent literature, Schwinge is the best known advocate of this trend, although he inclines a little more towards Winnington-Ingram.

Winnington-Ingram went further than Dodds and Grube; his view of the Pentheus character was concisely formulated by Diller (p. 477): 'Pentheus ist ein isolierter Bakchant, ein Widerspruch in sich, und damit zum Scheitern verurteilt'.

On the other hand, Diller did not wish to go as far as Dodds: even on his journey to Cithaeron Pentheus remains the man who wants to show

---

[37] I find Rosenmeyer's comparison too superficial. (i) Pentheus still has a whole episode to play (918-70) and the audience is kept informed of his last words and acts in the second messenger speech (1043-1137). In the *Ag.* it is only a question of a blow (τύπτει 1128, which is not even the physical blow). (ii) Does it really make sense to call the carpet scene in Aeschylus the death of the soul, in contrast to a death of the body, which must still follow it? (iii) Agamemnon has a clear motive for abandoning his opposition to his wife, cf. Fraenkel p. 441: 'What is the use?' But in the *Bacchae* the core of the problem is caused by Pentheus' lack of such a clear motive.

[38] Ernst-Richard Schwinge, *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides*, Heidelberg 1968, 339-433.

[39] P. 379f. Schwinge argued against Rosenmeyer 'dass selbst "the death of the soul" erst 846 vollendet sei'; for his objections to Merklin's interpretation see below, note 214.

up an enemy, but he has lost control of himself, and the Dionysiac control takes charge of him to destroy him.

Finally a fourth trend (Merklin, Rosenmeyer, Fors) rejects particularly the psychological approach of 812 ff. When the god gets bored with his cat and mouse game, Pentheus is driven mad by him and reduced to a giggling Peeping Tom. The god adapts the personality of his victim to his plan of destruction.

The work of all these scholars gives evidence of greater attention being paid to the Pentheus character than was previously the case. Indeed the role of Pentheus offers us a firm anchorage in that we are dealing with a realistic character whom we can describe on the basis of the action. The role of Dionysus, on the other hand, is much more complicated, because his divine presence in the action of itself gives occassion for divergent points of view among the critics. The greatest stumbling block is set by the question of whether we must somehow or other give the Dionysus of the *Bacchae* a symbolic function.[40] Pentheus is altogether more approachable as a dramatic character, and it is not therefore surprising that in the most recent literature about the *Bacchae* the figure of Pentheus has several times gained the investigator's exclusive attention (see p. 16 f.).

Traditional views also survive. H. Grégoire, who edited the *Bacchae* in the Budé series, repeats without compromise the thesis of the palinode theory, in which Pentheus is a villain and Dionysus sympathetic and sincere in his attempt to convert him (p. 233f.). Jeanne Roux, a recent editor of the *Bacchae*, is also outside the trends mentioned. Her view on the attitude of Euripides vis-à-vis the god Dionysus has links with the palinode theory, as witness her statement on the introduction of the third stasimon (p. 511): 'Euripide nous livre ici la pensée profonde d'un vieillard qui a enfin trouvé la béatitude et la paix de l'âme dans le dialogue avec le divin'. Her ideas about the Pentheus character are twosided, cf. p. 370f.: 'c'est un bon roi, aimé de ses sujets en dépit d'un caractère "un peu trop royal" (671), pieux envers les dieux et soucieux de s'acquitter au mieux de sa tâche de roi. ... Ses motifs sont purs. Mais, au lieu de réfléchir, il s'emporte et s'aveugle devant l'évidence que la sagesse (Tirésias, Cadmos) et l'âme des humbles (le berger) découvrent du premier coup d'œil. Il lui faudra souffrir avant de reconnaître, trop tard, son erreur'. Madame Roux gives her answer to the question of what Pentheus' error was in her introduction. She suggests (p. 43ff.) that

---

[40] L. H. G. Greenwood, *Aspects of Euripidean Tragedy*, New York 1953, ²1972, 32-58, defends the suggestion that a symbolic interpretation is impossible for the *Hippolytus* and the *Bacchae*, and a fortiori for other plays by Euripides. G. A. Seeck, Gnomon 41 (1969) 16-29, in his review of D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama*, Toronto 1967, protests against the careless use of the concept of symbolism for the gods in Euripides' tragedies.

Pentheus' real fault is that he is a sophist. Pentheus stands for 'le sophiste dans le cité, ou l'exaltation de la raison', against 'Dionysos dans la montagne, ou l'exaltation de la déraison'. The author acknowledges frankly that the treatment of the Pentheus character must then be called paradoxical,[41] but she gives no indication of how the audience were to have understood this. 'Le poète introduit [ses considérations morales] de façon un peu forcée, en travestissant le roi sophiste avant de le travestir en bacchante. Nous mésurons par là l'importance qu'il leur accordait. Elles constituent bien le 'message' qu'à la fin de sa vie il désirait à tout prix faire entendre aux Athéniens' (p. 49).

Anne Pippin Burnett examined the structure of the *Bacchae*, relating it to the myths about gods who roam the earth with a message.[42] Her opinion is that at the beginning of the play Dionysus and Pentheus are not yet inseparably linked with each other by a special destiny, the one as executioner and the other as victim; at that moment Pentheus is still free. The *Bacchae* is therefore the only tragedy that shows the audience a deed of *hubris* and the consequent act of *nemesis* (p. 19). Although Pentheus believes that he is acting in the interest of Thebes, he displays an ominous lack of αἰδώς (piety). He violates every unwritten law, in that he shows contempt for family, stranger and god (p. 20). With the earthquake and the fire the demonstration of Dionysus' divinity is complete (though not that of the stranger), and so Pentheus' error is manifest. He now knows at first hand that the power which he rejects is not a human power, and he also knows that his original justification for the rejection has in any case been shown by events to be wrong (p. 21). In the central part of the play the god offers his victim peace (804), rescue (806), alliance (808) and blessedness (for this Mrs Burnett refers to 1343, and to the pronouncements of the chorus 135 ff., 416 ff.), but Pentheus, who has been offered the love of god, refuses, and turns his back upon divinity (p. 23). In a non-psychological interpretation the author perceives the change in Pentheus as happening 'in a swift and magical pause that is marked by a break in the stichomythia'. She writes: 'Quite suddenly a prophet who has been kind, effeminate, languid, weak, scorned and threatened with death, imaged as a hunted animal, becomes hard, bull-like, energetic

---

[41] P. 44. Cf. p. 53: 'Ce sont les adorateurs athéniens d'*Agnomosyné* que visent, dans les *Bacchantes*, à travers la personne du roi de Thèbes paradoxalement traité de sophiste, les admonestations des Lydiennes. Ce sont eux qui préoccupent le poète', Madame Roux is perhaps inspired in this forced contrast between Pentheus and Dionysus by F. M. Wassermann, *Studies presented to D. M. Robinson* II (St. Louis 1953) 559-69, cf. p. 563: 'Euripides makes use of the mythological fight between god and king in order to make alive the two opposing and equally vital forces of his own day, man- and *polis*-centered rationalism, and god- and nature-centered emotionalism'.

[42] *Pentheus and Dionysus: Host and Guest*. CPh 65 (1970) 15-29.

and powerful, one who controls the lives of the others and is described as a hunter is. In exactly the same moment a ruling prince undergoes the reverse transformation; forgetting his cruel masculine strength, his contempt, and his public role, he becomes a creature who is pliable, womanish and weak, who is scorned, disguised and hunted like a beast' (p. 23). Her interpretation of 811 is reminiscent of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer: 'Pentheus' carpet scene is inaugurated, his dismemberment begun'.[43]

In 1970 a translation and commentary by Geoffrey S. Kirk was published. Kirk speaks sceptically of Dodds' conclusions about maenadism, but he follows him in his commentary on the Pentheus character, although he puts heavy emphasis on Pentheus' sexuality. He sees in Pentheus a typical tragedy tyrant ('arrogant reliance on mundane power', ad 506f.), with a sexual preoccupation which is typical of his character (ad 251-55): 'Pentheus, in fact, appears to have a special and personal preoccupation with sex... which could hardly be grounded in the facts about the Dionysiac cult that Euripides chooses to present'. Kirk also postulates here that Pentheus' condemnation of the new cult goes much further than is needed to ventilate a popular idea. About the scene 778-861 he remarks: 'his obsession with the women enables Dionysus to tighten his grip on Pentheus' imagination'. Pentheus' wearing of women's clothes—apart from the fact that it is a means to complete the public degradation of the king—is a perverse manifestation of Pentheus' own sexuality, and of his jealousy of the bacchae in this respect (ad 857-60).

Great emphasis was also laid on Pentheus' individual sexual desires by Jene A. Larue in 1967.[44] A psychoanalytical approach to Pentheus by William Sale appeared in 1972.[45] Sale warned his readers that his starting point was an important assumption: 'if we are to believe in Pentheus

---

[43] Mrs Burnett takes 804, as does Dodds, to be a genuine offer. But this interpretation is contested, see p. 76. The comparison with other opposition-myths sometimes, I think, leads the author to too far-reaching conclusions, cf. her statement p. 29: 'Thebes is in the end the Dionysus-worshipping city the god had meant it to be, but it is also the healthy and united city that Pentheus was ready to defend. The Theban women will return to hearth and sanity, their piety now all their own', etc. Information about Thebes has been lost in the lacuna, and the indications that we have point in the opposite direction, see the play's hypothesis and possible lines from *Chr.Pat.*, and see Willink CQ16 (1966) 48. Ch. Segal, Ramus 6 (1977) 116 also rejects Mrs Burnett's interpretation.

[44] *Prurience Uncovered: The Psychology of Euripides' Pentheus.* CJ 63 (1967-68) 209-14. The author examines the 'sexual imagery' (p. 214) of the play under the proposition: 'Dionysus is merely the symbol of the savage bestial side of Pentheus' own psyche' (p. 212).

[45] *The psychoanalysis of Pentheus in the Bacchae of Euripides.* Yale Classical Studies 22, Cambridge 1972, 63-82.

and his fate, we must of course discount the possibility that anything that happens to him is miraculous. ... Dionysus is the Thou of life and death—he *is* the natural, not the supernatural. Pentheus is a real man, real in all his parts; if we believe in the play, we must believe that what happens to him is natural. The central fact about Pentheus is illness and madness. He is sick from the moment we first see him: as Tiresias says: ἡ δὲ δόξα [σοῦ om. Sale] νοσῇ, "your thoughts are sick" (311). ... This makes him a logical case for psychoanalysis' (p. 65). From this point of view Pentheus lands 'on the couch', and his case is compared with a modern psychiatric case of transvestism.[46]

A comparable method, but this time in the area of psychosociology, was employed in the same year by Bernd Seidensticker.[47] In this case the material for comparison comprised a study by Theodor W. Adorno and others of the prejudiced, authoritarian, potentially fascist type of man, based on research into general ethnocentric ideologies, including anti-semitism, among inhabitants of the west coast of the U.S.A.[48] Just as did Sale, Seidensticker first draws up an outline of Pentheus' personality structure based on the text, and then compares it with the data on the authoritarian personality. Seidensticker, in the first part of his work, arrives at the following characterization of Pentheus (p. 51f.): 'Emotionale Labilität und unbewusste, sich immer wieder in seinen Worten und Aktionen offenbarende Affinität zum Dionysischen; Konservatismus und "Recht-und-Ordnung"-Denken, starre Fixierung auf ethnozentrische und patriarchalische Vorurteile, verbunden mit ausgeprägtem Streben nach Ehre und Macht, schliesslich stereotype Denkschemata, geistige Schwerfälligkeit, mangelnde Selbstkenntnis, Unverständnis für alles die Alltagserfahrung Übersteigende und Unbelehrbarkeit'. Seidensticker holds that the representatives of the psychological view, among whom he names Winnington-Ingram and Schwinge, have laid too much emphasis on the psychic instability and the irrational Dionysiac element in Pentheus; and that others have laid too much emphasis, among other things, on his 'geistige Schwerfälligkeit und Unbelehrbarkeit (Anne Pippin Burnett) and on his 'natürlichen Selbstbehauptungswillen' (Diller). On the basis of data supplied by *The Authoritarian Personality* Seidensticker holds that these different therories can be reconciled (p. 60): 'Wir begreifen jetzt den inneren "logischen" Zusammenhang, zwischen den verdrängten dionysischen Tendenzen und der psychischen Labilität auf der einen und der starren Fixierung auf stereotype, konventionelle

[46] Murray Lewis, *A Case of Transvestism*. International Journal of Psychoanalysis (1964) 345-51, cf. Sale p. 75ff.

[47] *Pentheus*. Poetica 6, München 1972, 35-63.

[48] *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York 1950.

Denkschemata und die Orientierung am Konkreten und Banalen auf der anderen Seite'.[49]

In 1976 an edition of the *Bacchae* appeared, with an introduction, commentary, and analysis of the lyric sections, by Maurice Lacroix. He continues the trend which can be observed in recent French criticism of the *Bacchae* by A. Rivier, A. J. Festugière, H. Grégoire, and J. Roux in the sense that all these authors have a clear opinion about Euripides' concept of religion in the play, a concept which according to them led to a new religious awareness, and one cleansed of false ideas (cf. Lacroix p. 18).

In the U.S.A. the *Bacchae* has been the subject of so-called 'imagery' research. W. C. Scott researched into the confusion between man and beast, the architectural terms, and the concepts of light and darkness in the play;[50] he claimed that by the systematic use of these three sets of images the poet conditions his audience, and when he piles these images together, in Pentheus' lines 918-22, he directs his audience's attention to the basic themes of the play.—The damage which the god causes to Pentheus' palace in 576 ff. is discussed by Victor Castellani as an image of the spiritual and moral destruction of Pentheus and his family.[51]—A study of the distribution of roles among the sexes in the *Bacchae* commands the attention of Charles Segal who describes the events of the play as *rites de passage*[52] both for the god and for the humans. Segal had earlier published an article on the *Bacchae* basing his views on an interest in myths[53]: starting with the idea that myths function as mediators between opposites (Levi-Strauss), Segal suggests that this mediating role of myths, which can be seen in social relations, should properly be discussed in tragedy.

Truth and deceit in the work of the poet were recently re-examined (since Hans Strohm) by Siegfried Jäkel.[54] Jäkel chooses a more modest starting point that Strohm, examining not the philosophical recognition in Euripides' work that everything that happens to man is deceptive, but the question of where in the dramatic reality the characters' speech and actions are truth, and where they are lies. Jäkel also displays a philosophical approach to the play in his study of the *Bacchae*; in the irony of the god turned man, who is at the same time man and god, and

[49] See Appendix 1.

[50] *Two Suns over Thebes: Imagery and Stage Effects in The Bacchae*, TAPhA 105 (1975) 333-46. See also below, note 342.

[51] *That troubled house of Pentheus in Euripides' Bacchae*, TAPhA 106 (1976) 61-83. See also below, note 338.

[52] *Sex Roles and Reversals in Euripides' Bacchae*, Arethusa 11 (1978) 185-202.

[53] *Euripides' Bacchae: Conflict and Mediation*, Ramus 6 (1977) 103-120.

[54] *Wahrheit und Trug in den Dramen des Euripides*, Arctos 11 (1977) 15-40, See p. 00f.

therefore in a certain sense the embodiment of both truth and deceit, the contradiction between truth and falsehood is cancelled out. In this. 'togetherness' of truth and falsehood there is no more room for the λόγος (reason), but only for the condition of an earthly paradise which the messenger paints for Pentheus (677 ff.): 'Und so hat es den Anschein, als wolle Euripides mit diesem, seinem vielleicht letzten Drama zum Ausdruck bringen, dass dieser Zustand jenseits von Trug und Wahrheit, dieser Zustand jenseits der Welt des λόγος für die Menschen nur möglich ist im religiösen Rausch' (p. 37).

CHAPTER THREE

THE AUDIENCE RESPONSE

From the history of the interpretation of the *Bacchae*, outlined in Chapter 2, it is plain that widely differing opinions are held about the role of Pentheus. On the other hand it has earlier been suggested (p. 14) that an approach to the *Bacchae* which concentrates on the role of Pentheus offers clear advantages—at least initially—over one which puts Dionysus as the central point, because Dionysus is a god, with all the resulting complications (What does Dionysus the god signify to Euripides and to his public? What significance has his appearance on the tragic stage?); and because the god appears in the action in such a way that the other characters only see in him a stranger from Lydia. But the public know that the stranger is the god Dionysus, and measure events by the yardstick of this predominant fact. The *Bacchae* is, therefore, even more than *Oedipus Rex*, a play in which a single sustained motif of tragic irony pervades practically the whole action, and this applies to all characters in the play with the exception of the god himself. This is the fundamental device used by the poet in the plot of the *Bacchae*.

Diller in his observations (cf. n. 34) made two interesting contributions to the study of the *Bacchae*; one, on the place of the *Bacchae* in Euripides' later work, will be dealt with in Chapter 5,[55] the other reviews the psychological approach to the role of Pentheus. Diller objected to Winnington-Ingram's theory that Pentheus' opposition to the god was caused by his own Dionysiac qualities: sexual passions and lust for power. Schwinge (op. cit. 380 and his n. 77) supports Diller in this objection. Indeed Winnington-Ingram's ideas can lead to the assumption that the motives for the action of dramatic characters are inherent in their psychological make-up and not in the complications of the plot. Disagreement with this assumption need not lead—as Diller had already stated—to an acceptance of Zürcher's proposal that Euripides created no consistent characters, but made them all subordinate to the dramatic effectiveness of the moment.[56]

---

[55] Diller suggests in this that Pentheus loses the battle of σοφία. He produces evidence to show that the *Bacchae* and the *Ion* have a remarkable correspondence in structure (p. 488): 'freilich ist der *Ion* das untragische Gegenstück zu den *Bakchen*'. See p. 75ff., and note 187.

[56] W. Zürcher, *Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides*, Basel 1947.

I believe that one should not rely exclusively here on Aristotle, who ascribes greater importance to the plot than to the characters (*Poetics* 1450a 20 ff.). The greater importance of the plot is given by the nature of the literary work itself, which is a stage play intended for performance. After all, there is no reason to suppose that the ancient spectator of a dramatic performance followed it in any other way than we do; that is in a continuous response to the *action.* This response is forward looking: expectations are continually being awakened and disappointed in the audience, and this includes expectations about the characters. The spectator's activity is ruled by the dramatic situation of the moment. An exception must perhaps be made for the psycho-drama, in so far as this has the object of revealing the motives of a given character by means of the dramatic action. We then end up, however, with a dramatic case history; even Ibsen (who is sometimes compared with Euripides) wrote plays which cannot be confined within such a narrow compass.

In Pentheus, as with most characters in most literary dramas, we are dealing with an imaginary person, who is thought of by the poet not in terms of his personality, but in terms of the action within which he must operate. In doing this the poet naturally imposes on himself all sorts of restrictions; he takes into account the function of the person, the recognizability of such a person, and so on, but still the character of the person exists only by virtue of the action in which he appears. Diller was not wrong in raising objections 'gegen eine Psychologie, die mit Hilfe von Momente, die jenseits des dramatischen Spiels liegen, zu motivieren versucht' (p. 477). When therefore we ask ourselves why a character in a play acts in such or such a way, we can best look for a reliable answer in the action, and at the moment that this action is being performed; methods based on assembling from the text random statements by the characters leave much to be desired. The action at the moment that it is performed has been written by the poet with his eye on the audience; what we must study is the audience's probable response to the action. It is there that the intention of the poet lies; there too perhaps lies an answer to questions about a character or about his motives for action.

This picture of the situation is really too simple. From the previous chapter it is abundantly clear how far opinions diverge when people describe Euripides' intentions with the *Bacchae.* This could not happen if the audience's response and the author's intention corresponded closely with each other; but one meets as great a divergence of appraisal in the audience's response to a dramatic work, as one does in the response of readers to a literary work; a modern illustration of this is, as we have seen, the response of the audience to Pasolini's *Teorema.* On the other hand we must stick to the assumption that the intention of the dramatic

poet is directed towards the response of his audience, and that this was certainly the case in antiquity; the thought that Euripides also wrote over the heads of his public for a select and erudite group of future readers is not tenable in view of the social context within which the dramatic performances took place before the citizenry of Athens. In so far as the poet had the intention of arousing an insight into the dramatic reality which was being performed, he directed his efforts at the audience.

In studying the audience response to the *Bacchae* I distinguish a number of aspects or levels of Euripides' intention when he wrote the play. In order to describe these aspects or levels properly, the terminology used must first be outlined as clearly as possible.

It is customary in the study of dramatic composition to distinguish between *story* and *plot*. The story is the sum of events in their chronological order in past, present and future, which are relevant to the play. The plot is the development of these events, played out or told upon the stage in the context of cause and effect provided by the author.[57] So the plot is the same as Aristotle's μῦθος, being the composition of the dramatic events (σύνθεσις τῶν πραγμάτων, *Poet.* 1450 a 4).

In contrast to story and plot, the word *action* relates to the realization of the plot in the performance (whether this performance is taking place in reality, or in the reader's imagination). Therefore the term is used in the rather limited sense applied to it by dramatic criticism.[58] Used strictly in this sense, then, the action is the dramatic play, the portrayal of a fictitious reality (a) through actors, and (b) directed at an audience.[59] The action works itself out in a flow of 'shifting impressions' (Styan), that is to say: it is the process by which the activities on the stage, prescribed by the

---

[57] Cf. M. Pfister, *Das Drama. Theorie und Analyse*, München 1977, 265ff.

[58] In using the term 'action', I do not follow Pfister's description of 'Handlung', nor of 'Handlungssequenz' and 'Handlungsphase', as distinct from, on the one hand, 'Geschichte', and, on the other, from 'Geschehen'. All this, apart from making dramatic analysis unnecessarily complicated, does not seem very illuminating for an audience-centred approach to drama. A description of 'action' that serves my needs is given by J. L. Styan, *The Elements of Drama*, Cambridge 1960. Next to it comes Bernard Beckerman, *Dynamics of Drama. Theory and Method of Analysis*, New York 1970. A judicious study of the subject, though scarcely known outside the Dutch language area, is by J. I. M. van der Kun, *Handelingsaspecten in het drama*, Nijmegen 1938. This book still matches remarkably well more recent definitions of action, cf. my *Een theorie van de handelingsaspecten in het drama*, Lampas 8 (1975) 237-47.

[59] Cf. Beckerman, *op. cit.* 50: 'The actors fulfilling their projects generate the activity that, in turn, produces the theatrical tension. The sequence, or path, of theatrical tension is the action, the flow of which creates the illusion of inner life. The configuration of the activity thus contains the action so that activity and action can never be truly separated except for analytic purposes. But just as an audience cannot receive the sensation of the action except through the activity, so the performers cannot create the action except through the activity'.

author and played out by the actors, condense into the theatrical impressions on the audience.[60]

The public at the performance respond to this flow of interacting impressions: they experience and understand the portrayal of a fictional reality. At the same time, this fictional reality refers to their own world. The aim of this book is to study the response of the audience for whom Euripides wrote his *Bacchae.* I purposely do not refer to this response by the German term 'Rezeption', since that word is used predominantly to describe the diachronic assessment of a literary work.[61] On the other hand, one may object that 'audience response' is a superfluous term, because the same goal is served if we approach the literary work from the angle of 'the writer's context': the poet and his original public shared the same world. To a certain extent this objection is justified: the author's intention and the audience response are the two ends of the same rope. But precisely because of this, we might to our advantage place ourselves in the position of the public, and ask ourselves throughout, line by line, what sort of suggestions on the stage made what sort of impressions on the audience through their ironic interplay. Of course, here too, our answers cannot be complete, but, on the assumption that Euripides consciously wrote a tragedy that should best satisfy the demands of beauty, eloquence, suspense and emotional charge as a theatrical performance, our best safeguard against our own illusions may be found in the performance itself. In doing this we might have the best chances of drawing tentative, but reasonable conclusions about the play's effect, i.e. about the author's intention. So we must first ask ourselves what precisely is meant by audience response.

Aspects of the audience response

Bernard Beckerman distinguishes four levels, or perhaps more accurately, four aspects, in the response of a spectator to the action of a play: the descriptive, the participational, the referential and the conceptual.[62] This division supplies a frame for the examination of audience

---

[60] Styan, *op. cit.* 68, has expressed this diagrammatically. Suggestions on the stage interact with each other at the moment of performance (Styan calls it: 'ironic interplay') and produce a series of impressions in the audience. From the impressions the spectator deduces, during and after the performance, his conclusions about the development of the plot, the characters, and the meaning of the play. Styan refers to 'the play's effect'.

[61] Cf. Hans Robert Jauss, *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation.* Frankfurt 1970, 231-51.

[62] Cf. p. 159f.: 'Theatrical meaning may be divided into four levels, or perhaps more accurately, four aspects. These aspects are the descriptive, participational, referential and conceptual. The descriptive aspect most exactly parallels the literal level of medieval interpretation; it is concerned with accurate recognition of dramatic activity. The participational aspect, which covers the relation between the art being created and the auditor

response to the *Bacchae* in this book, without, however, keeping too strictly to Beckerman's definitions of these aspects—which are in any case somewhat vague.

First we must note a dichotomy in the four aspects specified. The first two, the descriptive and the participational, are based inside the theatre on the dramatic reality of the performance. The last two, however, the referential and the conceptual, extend beyond the theatre to the reality of the audience. The dichotomy is parallel to that between πράττειν meaning to act and πράττειν meaning to live one's life, and therefore expresses the mimetic character of the theatrical performance.

The *descriptive aspect* enables the spectator to recognize and understand the dramatic activity that is developed before his eyes. All the information which the audience obtain about the dramatic reality falls under the heading of the descriptive aspect. This aspect supplies the spectator with his knowledge of the story and his insight into the complications of the plot: in addition it describes the characters for him. This aspect is the most comprehensible for us, because its suggestions are provided almost exclusively by the text. In this way the use of various types of language by the poet, particularly where this runs counter to or reinforces the pattern of expectations set by the level of the tragedy's style, gives an indication to the spectator of how he should interpret the dramatic situation, although this is not always clear to us now. When for instance Pentheus declares his displeasure with Cadmus and Teiresias in the common idiom, its function is clear (see p. 43 and note 107), but when the soldier (433 ff.) speaks in hunting metaphors, it is much harder to define the function of the language: does it characterize the actor in the role of messenger, does it sum up the character of the dramatic situation, or is it merely a linguistic ornament?

The *participational aspect* refers to the emotional involvement on the part of the spectator. Beckerman says that it is the central aspect for the dramatic experience; rightly, I believe, since the participational aspect can be closely correlated with Aristotle's clear statements about pleasure being the object of drama.[63] Aristotle associates pity and fear or horror with the emotion of a tragic performance, although he also speaks of other emotions: the bewilderment caused by a well constructed recogni-

---

responding *at the moment* of creation, is not peculiar to the theater or to any other performing art. But in the theater, participation is both more complex and all-encompassing, making this aspect so much more central to the total experience. The referential aspect embraces all kinds of associations between the articulated activity and non-theatrical experience. Lastly, the conceptual aspect includes all imaginative abstractions aroused by a theatrical work'.

[63] *Poet.* 1453b 11: ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ ἐλέου καὶ φόβου διὰ μιμήσεως δεῖ ἡδονὴν παρασκευάζειν τὸν ποιητήν, φανερὸν ὡς τοῦτο ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐμποιητέον.

tion scene (*Poet.* 1454a 4, 55a 17) or the pleasant sensation of the effect of surprise (60a 17). We can enjoy, as the ancient spectator could, the wit of a scene in which misunderstanding or deception is played out. (In the 'true tragedy' in which the plot shows a reversal from a good to a bad situation, the experience of such witty scenes reinforces the ultimately overriding emotions of pity and fear or horror).

But in studying the audience response of an ancient Greek play, the participational aspect can only operate on a limited scale. The emotions we experience on reading the play, are not necessarily the same as those experienced by a public in classical time.[64] And even so the participational aspect stands rather isolated, because dramatic emotion, and the *catharsis* associated with it,[65] may be an end in itself. From the participational aspect *alone*, we cannot draw safely any conclusions about the play's effect extending beyond that particular emotion. For instance: it is possible that the destruction of Pentheus in the *Bacchae* aroused fear (φόβος) in the spectator in the sense of Rivier's 'l'effroi sacré'; if we try to conceptualize this aspect, it may lead to: 'Dionysus is a great god who destroys his adversary, and who is glorified by the poet in his play', Another possibility is that the destruction of Pentheus aroused pity (ἔλεος) in the spectator, in the sense of sympathy with his sufferings; this, when conceptualized, may lead to: 'Dionysus is a cruel god who destroys his adversary, and about whom a warning is issued by the poet'.[66]

Therefore the participational aspect can only be a reliable instrument when it reinforces other aspects of audience response. If, for example, we establish on the descriptive level that the plot of the *Bacchae* is constructed in such a way that Dionysus has made it difficult for Pentheus and Thebes to believe in his divinity, and if afterwards we see that Cadmus' and Teiresias' belief in the divinity of Dionysus in 170-200 has some comic elements, we may conclude that the humour has been written by Euripides in this last scene to reinforce the improbability in the eyes of Pentheus and Thebes, of Dionysus' divine nature.

---

[64] Cf. Beckerman, p. 162: 'Obviously, the participational aspect of meaning is but weakly represented by a reading of the text; only during performance does its full weight become apparent. We cannot grasp that aspect of meaning by imagining it or reading about it, because it is accessible only to those *within* the event'. In the case of Greek tragedy this aspect is to a large extent lost forever, because a modern performance can for a variety of reasons (stage technique, social and religious background etc.) not repeat an ancient one exactly.

[65] On the relation of dramatic emotion and catharsis, cf. D. W. Lucas, *Aristotle, Poetics*, Appendix II.

[66] There are naturally further possibilities: the spectator who watches the god's vengeance with a holy shudder, can none the less draw the conclusion that Euripides is condemning the god. Great pity for Pentheus' undeserved punishment does not stand in the way of a pious belief in the greatness of Dionysus.

The *referential aspect* deals with a spectator's reality outside the theatre, because dramatic action structures, orders and clarifies his world outside the theatre.[67] Since art is *mimesis*, it is also *instruction*: it furnishes the spectator with insight into his own reality. When therefore we consider action as 'things happening, framed by art', and when we consider character as 'a person behaving, framed by art', then the audience response must involve the spectator not only perceiving this structure as a theatrical performance (descriptive aspect), during which his emotions are stirred (participational aspect), but also his relating this structure to his own reality (referential aspect). The reference is that which the theatrical reality and the reality outside the theatre have in common.

Not all references provide a referential aspect in the sense used above. After all, everything that goes on in the theatre is *mimesis*: language, gestures, costumes, the theatre building, etc. One can only call it the referential aspect when the performance relates a spectator to his own reality. So the appearance in the action of an everyday expression is descriptive: it describes the action, not everyday life; but the appearance of Dionysiac rites in the action is referential, as it suggests that it gives a portrayal of the real Dionysiac rites. Generally the referential aspect has two components: what is familiar to the spectator, and what is new or surprising to him (he had never looked at the Dionysiac rites from that angle). This brings us to the fourth aspect, which is when the referential aspect crystalizes into a view, an opinion.

The *conceptual aspect* deals with concepts, with ideas about the fictitious reality shown in the action, and about the implications of it for the reality outside the theatre. Through his play the poet teaches his public about the world he shares with them: it goes without saying that it is his experience of reality that counts. In the study of Greek tragedy it is a safe assumption that the poet communicates his ideas in a strictly indirect way; that is to say, through action, through characters.[68] Action is only presented as each character in turn makes it reality from his own 'perspective'; accordingly, the conceptual aspect can only be approached in a similar indirect way, that is to say, through the descriptive, participational and referential aspects of the audience response. By these three aspects, all containing meanings of the play, the parameters are set within which we are able, as well as the then public was, to speculate about the poet's ideas expressed in the play.

---

[67] Cf. Arist. *Phys.* 199a 15; ὅλως δὲ ἡ τέχνη τὰ μὲν ἐπιτελεῖ ἃ ἡ φύσις ἀδυνατεῖ ἀπεργάσασθαι, τὰ δὲ μιμεῖται. See D. W. Lucas, *Aristotle Poetics*. Appendix I: Mimesis, particularly p. 265-66.

[68] Cf. Pfister 3.5. (Die Perspektivenstruktur dramatischer Texte) and 3.6. (Epische Kommunikationsstrukturen im Drama), pp. 87-121.

What are we expected to do, when we are confronted with a breakdown of perspective? The most familiar example of this is the utterances of the tragic chorus: what is the relationship between the poet's ideas, and the statements made about the action in the choruses? This problem cannot really be discussed in general terms, since the function of the chorus altered greatly in the period in which we are able to review it, from Aeschylus to Euripides.[69] It is certainly valid for the whole of tragedy that the members of the chorus, no less than the actors, are associated with the fictitious reality of the action: they are not an abstracted narrator, placed between spectators and actors, but they are linked by their presence to the place, time and action of the play. The chorus therefore have their own perspective, no less than the characters have, whether they are advancing an opinion about the action, or singing a 'mood song' which is more loosely connected with it. But even when the chorus move outside what appears to us to be their own perspective, we cannot draw any safe conclusion from this, because the tragic poet clearly did not consider himself tied to the perspective in the way that we think a writer of drama is. The first stasimon of the *Bacchae* (370-433) gives us an example of such a breakdown of perspective. The chorus, composed of Lydian women, appear not only to be very familiar with the traditions of Greek poetry (see chapter 6), but also with the controversies ruling in the Athens of Euripides' own time. This implies either that Euripides saw in this no breakdown of perspective, or that although Euripides was well aware that the chorus' utterances are not consonant with their perspective of being barbarian women from Asia, he wished to give his play referential aspects which did not stem obviously from the established myth. It is plausible to expect, from the nature of the referential aspects in this chorus (the praise of Dionysiac wisdom and happy life, escapist wishful dreams, aversion from cleverness and presumptuous men) that the poet intended these aspects to condense for the spectator into a clear idea about Dionysiac religiosity: but one cannot accept the pronouncement of the chorus, without more comment, as being the ideas of the poet himself. The beauty of this particular stasimon has in the past led many readers, using kinaesthetic arguments, to do just this. In fact we here touch upon the participational aspect, from which alone (see above p. 25) no conclusions can be drawn about the poet's ideas.

Audience response and author's intention are the two ends of the same rope. In speaking of the different aspects or levels of audience response in the *Bacchae*, we are speaking about the audience Euripides had in mind

[69] Cf. Jürgen Rode, *Das Chorlied* in W. Jens, ed., *Bauformen* 99-115, and chapter 10 of this book.

when he wrote his play. That audience is present in the work in an implicit, intended and substantial way, whereas the public performance of the play was attended by an explicit, accidental and formal audience. Differences in the response of these two audiences affect only the second; examples are unfortunate incidents in a dramatist's career, such as when he puts rags upon an actor to arouse pity, and the result from the actual public is laughter; or when the line: 'After the waves I now again see a sea that is calm' (*Or.* 279) by clumsy pronunciation is understood as: 'From the waves I now again see a weasel come'. Such incidents in the career of Euripides, made famous by Aristophanes, are relevant to the history of theatrical performance.

So the different aspects of audience response correspond with the different meanings the poet intended to attach to his play, and 'aspects of audience response' is synonymous with 'aspects of meaning'. For Greek tragedy we can make the most reliable statements about the descriptive aspect of meaning. The construction of the plot, the make-up of the characters, the function of the use of language, are constituents of the action which are offered for study by means of the text as it has come down to us. Secondly the referential aspect of meaning should be considered, although this is more difficult. We do not know all the references in a play, and we cannot always be sure that what we see as a reference, was also one for the poet and his public.[70] In the case of the *Bacchae*, in which the god Dionysus and the phenomenon of maenadism play such an important role, an examination of at least these references is relevant. In the field of the participational and conceptual aspects of meaning it has already been said that we can be far less sure. One can also imagine that the poet deliberately fashioned the possibility that his audience would arrive at different emotions about the action and, consequently, at different ideas. Nevertheless, a work of art like the *Bacchae* demands of us, after having established the most probable descriptive and referential aspects of meaning, and after having noted those particular participational aspects of meaning that seem to corroborate them, to make an attempt to conceptualize the meanings we have found in the action.

Plot and story nucleus

The first area for research into audience response in Greek tragedy lies at the level of descriptive aspects of meaning. The spectator has at his disposal two sorts of references. As he follows the performance he is con-

---

[70] There is for example a well-known argument on whether or not Euripides in some of his plays (*Hipp.*, *Hel.*, *Bacchae*) refers to ideas from Orphism.

tinually involved in his own reality: his language, and the meaning that he attaches to nuances in the use of language, his knowledge of political and social affairs, his environment generally. Among the spectator's references there are also a great many that are associated with the theatre itself: the knowledge he has of theatrical conventions, such as the language of tragedy, the structure of a dramatic action, and so on. It is probable that this knowledge was fairly extensive, since the average visitor at the Great Dionysia, even if during the rest of the year he never visited the Lenaea, or performances in the Attic provincial theatres, still reached an annual quota of about twenty plays, and can therefore be considered to have been an experienced theatre-goer. The play that he saw was very tightly bound by a large number of conventions.[71] The rigidity of the bonds of theatrical convention for tragedy is strikingly illustrated, when we see how gradually the norms for the application of resolution to the tragic trimeter are widened, and, on the other hand, how strongly the distinction between the treatment of comedy and tragedy on this point is maintained. Particular attention is focused on just one of the theatrical conventions.

The plots of Greek tragedy can be reduced, on the basis of the nucleus of their story (revenge, sacrifice, etc.) to a small number of types of drama. Anne Pippin Burnett has researched into combinations by Euripides in one play of contrasting types of plot, that is to say, of plots where the *metabasis* progresses from good fortune to a bad one (ἀπ' εὐτυχίας εἰς δυστυχίαν) and vice versa.[72] She writes (p. 16): 'It is possible to deduce from surviving tragedy the general outlines of the six favourite hypothetical plots. These include three representatives of negative overturn and three of positive overturn, so that each of the two major dramatic movements could be depicted in relation to a principal who was passive, active, or who acted upon himself.' I prefer to speak not of

---

[71] Ancient drama is remarkably strictly confined by theatrical convention compared with twentieth-century drama. In this connection it is appropriate to make a comparison with what Miss Dale (LM 8f.) has noted about the rhythm of English, compared with Greek, poetry. The variety of rhythm in English poetry lies in the sphere of the infinite, τὸ ἄπειρον, whereas the variety of rhythm in Greek poetry (which is greater than it is in modern European languages) is based on a finite number of presented metrical forms, τὸ πέρας. *Mutatis mutandis* this distinction is also valid for dramatic composition. The Greek playwright selects from a large number of forms prescribed by theatrical convention. He varies the structure, but always so that it is still recognizable by the spectator. The unexpected in his production lies in the choice, combination and variation of existing structures. Contemporary dramatic composition is always on the look out for new structures, and in fact tries to break with theatrical convention.

[72] *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal.* Oxford 1971. Euripides surviving plays which in her opinion qualify for this description, and are examined by her, are *Alc., IT, Hel., Ion, Andr., Her., Or.*

'hypothetical plots', but of 'story nuclei',[73] three of them with negative, and three with positive, reversals. In each triad we can distinguish between (i) passive, (ii) active and (iii) 'middle' according to whether a dramatic character (often the protagonist) is (i) the passive victim of a negative or positive reversal: the drama of *(divine) punishment* and the *suppliant drama* respectively; (ii) actively takes independent action against others: drama of *revenge* and of *rescue*; or (iii) arranges his own affairs: the drama of *sacrifice*, in which a character deliberately seeks his own downfall (Antigone) and that of a *return*, in which a character lays claim to his position and to the fortune which belongs to him (Orestes). These types of drama, and the combination of contrasting types in one play, do not belong to Euripides' personal arsenal, but to the tragic conventions; already in Aeschylus we meet in the *Choephori* the combination which is so popular of three story nuclei:[74] revenge (Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus), rescue (Electra), and return (Orestes—completed eventually in the *Eumenides*).[75] Mrs Burnett's classification into six types has not gone without question, and it is indeed arguable whether the 'return' ever constituted a plot by itself, without the action being shared with punishment, revenge, or sacrifice.[76] Nevertheless, the separate classification of 'the return' as an independent story nucleus can be justified on the ground that bloodshed in a drama of punishment or of revenge is only repayment, but that the return (which is not necessarily associated with a drama of punishment or of revenge) humanizes this repayment.[77] So too an action of sheer self-destruction is humanized when others are rescued by it.

The plot of what Mrs Burnett calls 'the mixed and multiple action', is therefore characterised by there being, in the one play, at least one rever-

---

[73] Here the term *plot* does not correspond with the definition given previously, in which the plot in fact consists specifically of the actual stringing together of activities on the stage (πράγματα) devised by the poet. A "hypothetical plot" in the sense which Mrs. Burnett gives to it, does not therefore fit my theory. I could have spoken of "story-patterns" (cf. Richard Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy*, London 1964) or, but this term is used in many different meanings, of "motifs" (cf. Hans Strohm, *Euripides. Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form*, München 1957). I use the term *story nucleus* in this context.

[74] Soph. *El.*, Eur. *Cresph.* (cf. A. P. Burnett, 9-13).

[75] Together with the *Agamemnon* there are two plots in this trilogy which display an action of multiple, contrasting, story nuclei; for the *Agamemnon* contains one story nucleus of revenge/punishment, and one of "interrupted return", comparable to the story necleus of "interrupted revenge" in *Ion, Or.* It is not therefore, in my opinion, right to see mixed plots in Sophocles and Euripides as the tragedians' answer to a dismantling of the trilogy which consisted of a sequence of plots with a single action, as Mrs. Burnett plainly does (p. 2f.)

[76] Cf. Ch. Garton's review in AJPh 95 (1974) 399.

[77] Cf. A. P. Burnett, who refers to another possibility of the single vengeance action (p. 9 n. 8): "demonization of the principal" (*Med.*, *Hec.*).

sal from good to bad, and at least one from bad to good.[78] The merit of Mrs Burnett's study lies particularly in the way in which she shows how Euripides has used dramatic conventions in a revolutionary way in relation to these story nuclei, in order to give his experienced audience new

---

[78] Mrs. Burnett's theory of the concepts of "mixed reversal" and "mixed and multiple action" is in my opinion too complicated. She distinguishes (1) *single action* and (2) *single* versus *compound plot.*
ad (1). She obviously bases this term on Arist. *Poet.* 1453a 12 vv. ἀνάγκη ἄρα τὸν καλῶς ἔχοντα μῦθον ἁπλοῦν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ διπλοῦν (cf. pp. 1-2 and n. 2), but what does Aristotle mean here by μῦθος ἁπλοῦς? Of itself the term is naturally a far from happy choice, since elsewhere in the *Poetics* Aristotle by μῦθος ἁπλοῦς understands a plot without peripeteia and anagnorisis, as opposed to μῦθος πεπλεγμένος—evidence of the unrevised state in which the text has come down to us (D. W. Lucas ad loc.), or just of an error (J. M. Bremer, *Hamartia*, p. 23 n. 23). Against the μῦθος ἁπλοῦς of 53a 12 Aristotle sets the plot which has the following σύστασις (31ff.): ἡ διπλῆν τε τὴν σύστασιν ἔχουσα καθάπερ ἡ 'Οδύσσεια καὶ τελευτῶσα ἐξ ἐναντίας τοῖς βελτίοσι καὶ χείροσιν. From the example of the *Odyssey* it appears that the difference between ἁπλοῦς and διπλοῦς is not connected with the unity of the action, which is discussed in chapter 8 (51a 24). Rostagni (ad 53a 36) suggests that the μῦθος διπλοῦς refers to "una forma di Trag. con finale parte lieto parte triste"; the μῦθος ἁπλοῦς 'si tratta proprio di mito πεπλεγμένος, ma avente un' *unica* linea di scioglimento, la quale, più precisamente, dev' essere dalla felicità all' infelicità e non viceversa' (ad 53a 12). We have no examples of the μῦθος διπλοῦς in the tragedies of Sophocles or Euripides (Lucas ad 53a 32 suggests Sophocles *Electra*); conversely, are plays with a happy ending (*Ion, IT, Hel.*) ἁπλοῦς, or does Aristotle not count them? Rostagni believes (ad 53a 36) that this provides a third tragic form, but it does not seem to me likely that this is what Aristotle meant, because he would then have listed (for example) *IT* instead of referring to comedy: his example from comedy is plainly intended to mean that the inferior double-plot leads to a perversion of tragedy which in its best form shows a change from good to ill fortune δι' ἁμαρτίαν τινά. I therefore think that neither the μία καὶ ὅλη (καὶ τελεία) πρᾶξις from chapter 8, nor the μῦθος ἁπλοῦς from chapter 13 can be equated with A. P. Burnetts 'single action', in which category she only classes (p. 3 n. 4): *Phil., OT, OC, Med.* and *Bacchae.*
ad (2). The distinction between a 'simple' and 'compound plot' is naturally based on Aristotle's μῦθος ἁπλοῦς as against πεπλεγμένος (1452a 12ff.). Mrs. Burnett makes a distinction between a 'major' and a 'minor' peripeteia (p. 4): 'Major peripeteia occurs where a distillation of the tragedy's entire praxis has become the matter of the stage action, as with Oedipus and his discoveries, in the episode that follows the withdrawal of Jocasta to her noose. ... The second sort of peripeteia, the minor sort, is the representation of an overturn that is opposite in its direction to that of the praxis'. As an example of minor peripeteia she gives S. *Phil.* 866ff. where Philoctetes 'is suddenly brought from joy to despair while he gains a new understanding of his situation, though the context is that of his positive reversal in a rescue plot'. It seems to me that this distinction is confusing and does not work in her treatment of Euripides' plays of 'mixed reversal'. In the first place there is not even unanimity over the question of which plays in the surviving corpus contain examples of Aristotelian peripeteia, and which do not, cf. D. W. Lucas op. cit. Appendix III. In the second place, Mrs. Burnett pays most attention to the minor peripeteia (p. 4). The index to her book only once mentions the use of the word peripeteia in her analyses, on p. 51, where, speaking of the scene in *IT* 467-642, she says of Iphigeneia: 'In the brief time since the captives were brought to her she has experienced a full peripeteia from despair to hope', and I see no relationship in this sentence to her definition of minor peripeteia. On the other hand, *Andr.* 995ff. is, at least from the audience's point of view, an obvious example of peripeteia (Lucas, however, counts the *Andr.* as an example of the single plot, p. 295). Mrs. Burnett talks at this point (p. 149) of 'the most audacious *coup de théâtre* to have survived from the Attic stage'. The sudden an-

perceptions of the paradoxes in his plays. She sums up his dramatic composition (p. 16): 'The spectator found himself confrontated with a stage world that had, moment by moment, all the appearance of banality, but which jarred him as one may be jarred by the surrealist's confrontation of the teacup and the shoe.' It is the poet's deliberate attention to the norm, to convention, and his manipulation of the conventions, which perhaps puts us in a position to understand better his intention with the play: 'Euripides' "deviant" plays must thus be read against the "norms" of the tragic action that gave them their hallucinatory sense of safety betrayed, but those norms of course are never to be found in their pure form' (p. 16).[79] The plot of the Bacchae contains some elements to indicate that here too Euripides has varied the tragic norm, a variation that possibly provides an insight into his ideas about the action that he was composing.

Trickery and deceit

In most of Sophocles' and Euripides' plays trickery and deceit play a role. They do not in themselves form story nuclei, but, particularly in Euripides' dramatic composition, they are pre-eminently the means of developing the plot. In all six story nuclei trickery and deceit can be linked with intrigue; as far as we are competent to judge the situation, Euripides developed into the great master of this area in Attic drama. The characteristics of intrigue in the narrower sense, the *mechanema*, have been studied by Friedrich Solmsen.[80] Hans Strohm later made another examination of the use of trickery and deceit in Euripidean dramatic

---

nouncement that Neoptolemus will die in Delphi, sets the two parts of the plot, of the suppliant drama and of the rescue drama, in a bizarre light of human depravity and the senselessness of human actions; this moment particularly gives to this whole problematical play the 'hallucinatory sense of safety betrayed', of which Mrs. Burnett speaks on p. 16, when she explains the character of 'plays of mixed reversal'. But she does not make clear whether she here means major or minor peripeteia, if indeed she is speaking of peripeteia at all: Hermione, the only character on the stage who hears Orestes, leaves without saying anything.

Summarizing: I endorse P. T. Stevens' comment in his review of *Catastrophe Survived* (JHS 112 (1972) 197): '"reversal" here seems to correspond to Aristotle's metabasis rather than peripeteia', and I think that Mrs. Burnett's observations can also be illuminating for other plays than the seven which she examines, regardless of the question, of whether the plot is, by Aristotle's yardstick, simple or complicated, while I can get no closer explanation of the term 'mixed action' than 'dramatic action which combines in itself two or more conventional story nuclei'.

[79] Indeed, the 'pure form' is no more than a theoretical description. Thus H. C. Baldry (CR 24 (1974) 25) comments: 'Mrs Burnett too often writes as if Euripides had read the *Poetics* and constructed plays by devising variations on Aristotle's concepts'.

[80] *Zur Gestaltung des Intriguenmotivs in den Tragödien des Sophokles und Euripides*, Philologus 87 (1932) 1-17, included in E. R. Schwinge ed., *Euripides*, pp. 326-44.

composition against the background of Euripides' 'irrationalism'.[81] Solmsen describes Euripides' use of the *mechanema* as the calculating, deceitful choice and application of means designed to gain a personal profit. The purpose is fixed; the cunning party, in its role of cunning party, only reckons with the things that serve the purpose. Ethical objections are clearly abandoned for the sake of such *mechanemas*, the beautiful does not exist for them. The ends are one's own safety and happiness or just the destruction of the opponent; what matters is to find the right way to it and (this is decisive) to mislead the person at whom the *mechanema* is directed, about one's motive and goals.[82]

Trickery and deceit also play their part in the *Bacchae*. We shall take account of their function, comparing it with Solmsen's description of the *mechanema*. At the same time we must consider *mechanema* as a kind of egoistic human action, whereas in the *Bacchae* trickery and deceit are used as instruments of divine action, just as they are in the *Ion*;[83] but, in contradistinction to the *Ion*, Dionysus' tricks are aimed at a purely egoistic purpose: 'that I might be a god, to mortals manifest' (22, ἵν' εἴην ἐμφανὴς δαίμων βροτοῖς, cf. 860-61). In the *Bacchae* the irony of safety and happiness[84] also poses the question for us, whether the Euripidean *mechanema*, in the last play the poet wrote, had undergone a gruesome apotheosis.

---

[81] *Trug und Täuschung in der euripideïschen Dramatik*, Würzb. Jhb. für die Altertumswiss. 4 (1949/50) 140-56, included in E. R. Schwinge ed., *Euripides*, 345-72. As a continuation of Strohm's research, Siegfried Jäkel wrote: *Wahrheit und Trug in den Dramen des Euripides*. Arctos 11 (1977) 15-40. See p. 18.

[82] P. 329: 'die berechnende, listige Wahl und Anwendung geeigneter Mittel zu egoistisch erstrebten Zwecken. Das τέλος steht fest; τὰ πρὸς τὸ τέλος sind es, worauf das Augenmerk der μηχανώμενοι qua μηχανώμενοι gerichtet ist. Ethische Bedenken sind offenbar bei solchen μηχανήματα ausgeschaltet, das καλόν existiert für sie nicht. Die eigene σωτηρία und εὐτυχία oder aber das Verderben des Gegners ist das Ziel; dazu gilt es den Weg zu finden und (das kommt entscheidend hinzu) den, gegen den sich das μηχάνημα richtet, über Motiv und Ziele zu täuschen'.

[83] Dodds' opinion (Introd. xlvi) that the *Bacchae* is constructed on the same principle as the revenge-plays, *Medea, Hecuba,* and *Electra,* fails to appreciate an important difference. Dodds writes: 'the spectator's sympathy is first enlisted for the avenger and then made to extend to the avenger's victims'. But the spectator's sympathy with the title-roles in these three tragedies of revenge is aroused by their apparent defencelessness (naturally more in *Medea* and *Hecuba* than in *Electra*) and serves as justification for their mechanema to overcome this defencelessness. In the *Bacchae* the audience's sympathy with the persecuted stranger is of a different kind, since they know that the avenger is the god Dionysus, who is not in the least defenceless.

[84] 965 ΔΙ. πομπὸς δ' εἶμ' ἐγὼ σωτήριος. 1184 ΑΓΑΥΗ εὐτυχὴς γ' ἅδ' ἄγρα.

CHAPTER FOUR

PENTHEUS (1)—*BACCHAE* 1-656

This chapter and the next examine principally the descriptive aspects of meaning of the *Bacchae*'s action. The examination must first answer the question of how Euripides built up his plot, and secondly questions about the motives of the dramatis personae.

The prologue (1-63)

As in many of Euripides' other tragedies the prologue is spoken by a god. This god, Dionysus, is returning to the city of Thebes where, once, for the first time and prematurely, he was born, and he returns not in the shape of the god that he is, but in the shape of a man that he is not. These two factors that Dionysus is in Thebes, and that he is here in the shape of a man, are disclosed by the god in the opening lines (1-5); they are, so far as the perception of the audience is concerned, the key factors about the god in the plot, and in the prologue they are repeated emphatically, his presence 20-25, 32-36, 41, 42, 47-52, and his mortal shape 53-54.

The programme which the god unfolds for Thebes forms the main point of the prologue, taking up 23-54. The section that precedes this (1-22) has the character of a poetic formula in the combination of ἥκω (I have come) (1) with λιπών (leaving behind) (13), cf. *Hec.* 1-2, *Tro.* 1, and gives the audience information about events which took place in the period before the play opens, that is to say in the period that preceded ἥκω (I have come) (1), and that is reiterated in ἦλθον (I came) (20). These events cover the episode from the myth of Semele, which probably formed the material of Aeschylus' *Semele*, and immediately preceded his *Pentheus*; and also Dionysus' world-wide journeys before his present return to Greece, and the beginning of the action of the *Bacchae.*[85] In 23

---

[85] The much disputed text of 20-22 has been transmitted rightly: (λιπὼν δὲ ...θ' ... ἐπελθὼν...)

ἐς τήνδε πρῶτον ἦλθον Ἑλλήνων πόλιν
κἀκεῖ χορεύσας καὶ καταστήσας ἐμὰς
τελετάς, ἵν' εἴην ἐμφανὴς δαίμων βροτοῖς.

'Only after I had left Lydia and Phrygia, and had visited Persia, Bactria, Media, Arabia, and Asia, did I come on here to Greece (i.e. in order to dance and establish my rites), after I had danced there too, and established my rites there, so that (by doing so) I might be manifest to mankind as a god'. So too G. Hermann: 'peragratis multis Asiae regionibus, nunc primum ad hanc Graecorum urbem accessi, illic quoque sacris meis introductis'.

the audience's attention in again fixed on Thebes,[86] the place of the dramatic action, and it now comes to light that the god is not in Thebes unprepared, but that he has seen to it that the ritual shrieks have already been heard there, the fawnskins and the thyrsus already worn (23-25); he had done this *because* his mother's sisters said that Dionysus was not the son of Zeus but of some mortal or other, and that Zeus had killed Semele in her pregnancy with his lightning, as punishment for the lies which she had put about (to save her honour?) on the cunning advice of her father Cadmus (26-31). *Therefore* (τοιγάρ), explains the god, he has driven his mother's sisters mad, and forced them to put on the ritual clothing of his worship; and he has chased not only them, but all the women of Thebes, after driving them mad, out of their homes onto Mount Cithaeron, where they now live on unsheltered rocks under the pine-trees (32-38). *As a consequence*, so the god concludes this argument of why he particularly chose Thebes as the first Greek city in which to establish his rites: this city must learn, even if it will not, that it has not been initiated into his rites;[87] and he, the god, must defend the good name of his mother Semele by appearing as a god before men, a god whom she bore to Zeus (39-42).

In this chain of cause and effect it becomes clear that 23-25 must be understood otherwise than appears at first sight: although at first it seemed that Thebes had been admitted to the ranks of cities honouring Dionysus, it is now clear that the city has not been initiated into the Dionysiac rites, but that a process of awakening lies in store for her. Let-

---

The god intends to introduce his rites to Greece; this is implicitly expressed by καὶ ἐκεῖ, which is contrasted with ἐς τήνδε πόλιν, and so refers to the East. The god's behaviour has visible effects on the stage among the group of Lydian women who have travelled to Greece with him, and to whom Dionysus is ἐμφανὴς δαίμων. Wilamowitz's emendation to τάχει weakens this connection between Greece and Asia.—χθόνα (Chr. Pat.) for πόλιν (LP) is not necessary, cf. 58, where πόλις also has the meaning of an area of culture and occupation. Pierson's putting 20 after 22 is not supported by the new papyrus (see note 86). Besides it spoils the balance of the passage: Dionysus' journey has as its goal the manifestation of his divinity—this is the sense of 13-22. The poet follows a parallel procedure in 23-42. The suggestion made by J. Roux and M. Lacroix, who begin a new pericope at 21, and connect the participles χορεύσας and καταστήσας with ἀνωλόλυξα, so that δέ in 23 must yield to τε (Tricl.) is unacceptable for the same reason.

[86] The most recent find of a papyrus of the *Bacchae* (17-26), P. Berol. Inv. 21235 (ed. pr. W. Brashear, ZPE 19 (1975) 300) gives an evident improvement of the text (which had already been conjectured by Pierson): Θήβας τάσδε γῆς for Θήβας τῆσδε γῆς LP, cf. R. Kassel ZPE 21 (1976) 35.

[87] Elmsley and Bruhn (cf. Dodds) did not discern the only possible meaning for the construction of the participle after ἐκμαθεῖν, cf. Goodwin *Moods and Tenses* 904. But in addition, neither Murray, Dodds nor Roux take their translation far enough: it does not matter to Dionysus that Thebes still has to learn his rites, but it does that Thebes shall understand to the bitter end (ἐκ-) that she has not been initiated into his rites. Cf. Wilamowitz: 'Trotz allem Widerstand soll Theben fühlen, dass ihm der Segen meiner Weihen fehlt'.

ting the city know that she has not been initiated into the rites is the complement of Dionysus' disclosure to Thebes of his own divinity, and the real subject of the action,[88] which starts with the fact that all the Theban women have left their homes and are on Cithaeron. For a woman to leave home and family (cf. 702) is completely contrary to the social code, by which Greek women are strictly confined to their homes. This news that Dionysus gives therefore also shows that he has commited an act which is the beginning of an open conflict between the god and Thebes.[89] The audience realizes again that *all* the women have left Thebes, 35 f.: 'and all the female seed of the Cadmeians, all who were women, I drove in madness from their homes', καὶ πᾶν τὸ θῆλυ σπέρμα Καδμείων ὅσαι/γυναῖκες ἦσαν, ἐξέμηνα δωμάτων.[90] The reiteration is not intended to lay emphasis on the fact that men have been excluded, as Dodds suggests, since Teiresias and Cadmus will in fact be allowed among the women, cf. 1224; besides the Chorus calls on the city to join the women on the mountain, 105-19. Rather it is intended to emphasize the fact that *all* the women have left the city; in other words: there is an involuntary suspension of relations between the sexes. It is not the only time that the Athenian public had been faced with this theme (Ar. *Lys.*), but it is impossible to determine the participational aspect of meaning of 32-38: did these lines merely cause a smile, or did they make the audience, which was predominantly male, feel resentful, because the god had chosen to arrange a solution to his problem with wounded male pride?

In 43-46 the god outlines Pentheus' share in the history which has given rise to the dramatic conflict. Pentheus, still a very young man, is the present king of Thebes; he refuses, following the lead of his mother, to recognize the divinity of Dionysus. He offers him no libations, and makes no mention of him in his prayers. Semele's sisters had been driven mad, because they said that Dionysus was not born of Zeus, but was the

---

[88] Agave will say this in as many words at the end of the action (1296): Διόνυσος ἡμᾶς ὤλεσ', ἄρτι μανθάνω.

[89] On the other hand Anne Pippin Burnett, CPh 65 (1970) 19, believes that war has not yet been declared between Pentheus and Dionysus (see above p. 15). But driving the women mad *is* an act of war. It is true that Pentheus, because he does not recognize the god's existence, can only hold the women themselves responsible for their breach of the social code, but the audience know that it is Dionysus who has caused the breach. The poet employed the same device in *Hippolytus*: Hippolytus does not render Aphrodite the respect which is her due; the goddess reacts by causing social behaviour that breaches the code, in Phaedra's passion for her stepson.

[90] There is a difficulty in 35, of where the comma should be: before or after Καδμείων, see Dodds and W. J. Verdenius, Mnem. IV, 15 (1962) 338. The best answer seems to be to have no comma at all, and to accept ὅσαι γυναῖκες ἦσαν as tautological after πᾶν τὸ θῆλυ σπέρμα Καδμείων. Euripides does not mean to exclude slaves (Dodds), since Dionysiac piety is δημοτικόν, cf. 421-23. For the short pause after the fifth long *before* ὅσαι, cf. 273: οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην μέγεθος ἐξειπεῖν ὅσος / καθ' Ἑλλάδ' ἔσται.

fruit of a mortal association. When Dionysus says of Pentheus: ὃς θεομαχεῖ τὰ κατ' ἐμέ (who fights against my godhead) (45), he means the same thing: Dionysus is no god to Pentheus. (Pentheus cannot possibly see himself as a *theomachos*, because Dionysus the god is a non-existent phenomenon for him.[91]) The god then continues (47): 'Therefore I shall prove to him and to all the Thebans that I am in reality a god.'

The action therefore shows a process of learning, and the god impresses emphatically on the audience that this process (ἐκμαθεῖν, 39) applies not only to Pentheus, but to the whole city, men and women (39, 48, 50, 61) and that the lesson will perhaps involve armed strife between the men of Thebes, and the women on the mountain (50-52). By these observations the audience are again advised that the opening situation of the plot includes the fact that the god has interrrupted the pattern of the city's life by his separation of the sexes. In a twofold assertion the god next claims that *because* of this he has come to Thebes as a man and not as a god, thereby suggesting that the story nucleus of the plot is 'divine punishment or revenge'.[92] Moreover, given the fact that Dionysus the god is a non-existent phenomenon for Thebes, and given the fact that the god has kept his divinity hidden from Thebes, there are at this moment only two conceivable solutions to the conflict: either the god abandons his present disguise and demonstrates his divinity, or Thebes' opposition to Dionysus' divinity will be choked in blood.[93]

[91] J. C. Kamerbeek examined the word θεομαχεῖν comprehensively in *On the conception of* ΘΕΟΜΑΧΟΣ *in relation with Greek tragedy*, Mnem. IV, 1 (1948) 271. He shows that we first meet θεομαχεῖν in literature in *Bacchae* 45, and that the verb was in general use from the first half of the fourth century, and then apparently with the meaning: to undertake something which is impossible and against nature. Kamerbeek translates ὃς θεομαχεῖ τὰ κατ' ἐμέ in a way that can have two meanings (p. 278): 'who fights against my divine power'. But from the context, and from Kamerbeek's semantic research, the meaning of the words can be more accurately established as: 'who fights against god (i.e. who carries on an impossible struggle) and indeed against (i.e. denying the reality of) my divinity'. Kamerbeek in his article compares Pentheus with Hippolytus, but in doing so he ignores an important difference: Hippolytus certainly recognizes Aphrodite's divinity, (104: ἄλλοισιν ἄλλος θεῶν τε κἀνθρώπων μέλει), but does not himself want any close relationship with the goddess (102: πρόσωθεν αὐτὴν ἁγνὸς ὢν ἀσπάζομαι); Pentheus simply denies the divinity of the child Dionysus who was born (prematurely) to Semele, cf. 242-45. In addition Kamerbeek refers (p. 281) to Creusa in *Ion*, but here too we must remember that Creusa was consciously attacking the god, whereas Pentheus is only denying the existence of a non-god.

[92] The dramatic relevance of 53-54, precisely at this point, is so essential that it is inconceivable that one or both lines are spurious, cf. Dodds. Certainly ὧν οὕνεκα gives the impression of a 'rather clumsy repetition' (Dodds) cf. 30, 47. On the other hand the whole programme which the god sets out is placed in a sequence of cause and effect; Euripides perhaps did this deliberately to emphasize the god's offended tone, and to make his desire for vengeance felt.

[93] The threat of such a bloodbath remains present in the action (784, 809), even after the god's actions have made it illusory for the audience (845). Moreover blood really does

The first episode (170-369)

The first episode has two scenes: one between Teiresias and Cadmus (170-214) and, after Pentheus' appearance, a scene for three actors (215-369). Immediately on the entrance of Teiresias, the blind old seer of Thebes, the first scene gives the audience some information which they could not yet have obtained from the prologue or the parodos: the seer's fawnskin, ivy wreath, and thyrsus tell them that the god already has adherents among the Theban men. Teiresias' entrance and his conversation with Cadmus, Pentheus' grandfather, with whom he is going to the mountain to dance in honour of the god, have their aspects which also amused the audience in antiquity,[94] but serve besides to clarify the significance of the dramatic conflict as it had been presented by the god in the prologue. The comedy is provided by the staging: after the chorus have compared the bacchants in song and dance with a foal skipping round its mother as she grazes (165-69), two old men appear acting as bacchants. This act is a pose, even if it has perhaps been inspired by a sincere concern for Thebes, and by fear of the god (see below). But the arguments which the old men put forward for honouring the god are not based on merging their own identities in the group ecstasy of the Dionysiac thiasos (75), but on power politics: the interests of the reigning dynasty (Cadmus, 181-83), and the interests of traditional religion (Teiresias, 201-03).[95]

---

flow (748-68), but this bloodshed is the result not of an attack by the Theban men, but by the god, using the women whom he has brought to frenzy, cf. p. 73. But even with these qualifications it is still the case that the denouement of the dramatic conflict does not result from a military assault, as has been suggested by 50-52, so that the term *suggestio falsi* (see Dodds) is appropriate. For the way in which Euripides includes such a suggestion in the prologue, cf. Barrett ad *Hipp.* 42. R. Hamilton, TAPhA 104 (1974) 139-49 speaks of lines 47-52 as Dionysus' plan, the same one that was in fact to be carried out; 47-48 in the 'birth epiphany' in the palace miracles (576ff.), 50-52 in Pentheus' journey to Cithaeron, by which 'any expectation of a military confrontation of some sort is amply fulfilled by the warlike nature of Pentheus' misadventure in the mountains' (p. 149). However, Dionysus' manifestation in the palace miracle scene is no 'birth epiphany', see chapter 8, and particularly p. 139f., Pentheus' adventures on Cithaeron have nothing to do with any realization of 50-52, see chapter 5. I consider the suggestio falsi, in spite of the scanty evidence for doing so (cf. Dodds Introd. xxxv) as a deliberate reminder of Aeschylus' *Pentheus*, since it is presumably precisely in this point that Euripides' innovation lay, cf. p. 129.

[94] For the comic aspects of the Teiresias-Cadmus scene see Deichgräber (1935) 327 and Winnington-Ingram p. 40 and n. 1.

[95] It is also clear from Cadmus' question (191): οὐχοῦν ὄχοισιν εἰς ὄρος περάσομεν; 'dass all diese Begeisterung gewollt ist, dass Kadmos sich alt, hilflos und schwach fühlt' (Deichgräber p. 328). Teiresias' inclusion of Dionysus in the πάτριοι παραδοχαί is a 'glaring anachronism' (Dodds). It is true that a referential aspect of meaning is present here in that Teiresias' statements in 201-03 refer to fifth century controversies (see Dodds), and that the Athenian public was much less sensitive to anachronisms in such references than

A second comic aspect of the scene lies in the fact that they are old men, and themselves point this out with so much emphasis.[96] It is far from certain that Euripides wanted here to show a Dionysiac miracle of youth restored, because he treats the old men with irony (cf. Dodds p. 90f.), but the audience will certainly have been reminded of what the god had already achieved in Thebes: separation of the sexes. As shall soon appear from Pentheus' speech (215-41), the Thebans are upset that the women, by their departure, have imposed a 'strike' on sexual relations with their men, a strike that is aggravated by the knowledge that up there day and night is a seductive looking Lydian offering the women his amorous attention (233-38). The two old men are exempted from this annoyance, and they can meet the latest events with more open minds than can the other (cf. 196).

One can also detect a very serious note in this dialogue between Teiresias and Cadmus. The motive for the two old men's recognition of the god, and for offering him the worship which is his due, is fear; for both of them dancing is an obligation (Cadmus: 184, Teiresias: 207). They know that the god requires his τιμή (honour) (192, 208), and that if this requirement is not satisfied, calamity cannot be averted (362). Euripides does not make clear how it happens that Teiresias and Cadmus, but not the others, are able to believe in the divinity of Dionysus, but this is probably thanks to their intuitive wisdom, the same wisdom which led Cadmus to insist to Agave, Ino and Autonoe that his fourth daughter, Semele, was with child by Zeus (30).[97] In any case their fear makes them accept the god Dionysus, from an attitude to life which the chorus will soon comment in the first stasimon as Dionysiac wisdom (see p. 105 ff.):

---

we are. On the other hand, when it comes to descriptive meaning, the absurdity is emphasised—an absurdity that in my opinion has been deliberately introduced by Euripides—of Teiresias acknowledging that Dionysus is a new god, whose greatness must still be shown in Greece (272-74) and yet that he accepts his divinity as a tradition, as old as time itself. This absurdity means that the seer is certainly following, if not a false, at least an opportunist train of thought. This opportunism soon appears again, when Teiresias, following in Prodicus' footsteps, explains the god as the personification of παυσίλυπος οἶνος (278-83). This personification is indeed sacred and very ancient, but while the ancient goddess of Attica can also be called Γῆ, if preferred, her counterpart is anachronistically called ὁ Σεμέλης γόνος.

[96] Cf. 175 ἅ τε ξυνεθέμην πρέσβυς ὢν γεραιτέρῳ, 186 ἐξηγοῦ σύ μοι / γέρων γέροντι, 193 γέρων γέροντα παιδαγωγήσω σ' ἐγώ; and again 187, 188-89, 189-90, 194, 204, 207.

[97] Cadmus has had no special revelation about Dionysus, but he speaks from considerations of family politics, as is seen from his rhesis 330ff. (καταψεύδου καλῶς 334). Therefore I think that 182 Διόνυσον ὃς πέφηνεν ἀνθρώποις θεός is probably interpolated (Dodds and J. Roux both support it). The resemblance to 860 and the strengthening of the unconscious humour if we omit 182 (see Dodds) are, it is true, not decisive, but the interpolator betrays himself with πέφηνεν: Dionysus' divinity is still to be made apparent in Thebes, and is the god's τέλος in the action (860, cf. n. 216), see 20-22 (n. 85), 39-42, 47.

Cadmus appears as an exponent of φρονεῖν, (reason) by which one can keep one's home intact under the god's watching eye, (cf. 390, 394) when he says (199): οὐ καταφρονῶ 'γὼ τῶν θεῶν θνητὸς γεγώς (I am a mortal, I don't think lightly of the gods) and Teiresias rejects τὸ σοφόν (cleverness) (cf. 395) in 200-03.[98] The fear of the two old men will be sharply marked at the end of the episode when they leave for Cithaeron. He who takes part in the service of Dionysus was called by the chorus: μάκαρ, ὅστις...Διόνυσον θεραπεύει (blessed, who serves Dionysus) (82), but in Teiresias' mouth this service becomes the compulsion of slavery (366): τῷ Βακχίῳ γὰρ τῷ Διὸς δουλευτέον.[99]

When in 215 Pentheus himself appears on the stage, Thebes and he are faced with the following facts: all the women of Thebes have left the city and are on Mount Cithaeron (32-38), and there is a stranger from Lydia on Theban territory who is up there with the women (62-63). These two facts, together with an interpretation of them, are announced to the king (κλύω 216, λέγουσι 233). Also, that a procession of ecstatic women accompanies the stranger and calls upon Thebes to worship Dionysus (the parodos 64-169: Pentheus on his first appearance is silent about them); and lastly that the stranger claims that the child Dionysus, whom Semele had brought prematurely into the world, is a god (242-45, cf. 88-104). We must accept that Pentheus learns all these facts from the same source.

There are wide differences of opinion in *Bacchae* criticism about how we should interpret Pentheus' tirade on his first appearance in 215-47. Opinions vary from that of a good king, who is primarily concerned with the welfare of his country (e.g. Jeanne Roux, p. 370 f.) to that of 'the dark puritan whose passion is compounded of horror and unconscious desire' (Dodds ad 222-23). But the descriptive aspect of meaning of the action does not at this point justify a conclusion at either of these two extremes. It is, of course, possible that in the course of the action qualities and motives may be disclosed in Pentheus, which *will* justify such a conclusion, and that Pentheus' action may now or later acquire another dimen-

[98] The fear felt by Teiresias and Cadmus, imbedded in their rejection of τὸ σοφόν, is not apparent to Deichgräber; because of this, I suspect, he reached the untenable conclusion that in 395: τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία, the chorus are criticising Teiresias, Cadmus (see Dodds ad loc.) and, finally, the god himself in his appearance as σοφός (a description of the god which is right in itself, cf. p. 129f. and 164).

[99] Although the chorus is made up of βάρβαροι γυναῖκες (56, 604) they never use the word δουλεύειν of their service, although they describe the god as δεσπότης when they are released from their tribulations, 582 (cf. Barrett ad *Hipp.* 88). Δουλεύειν occurs only once more in the *Bacchae*, at the point when the irreconcilability of Dionysus' power with that of Pentheus is expressed in the tragic irony of 802f.: ΔΙ. ὦ τᾶν, ἔτ' ἔστιν εὖ καταστῆσαι τάδε. Πε. τί δρῶντα; δουλεύοντα δουλείαις ἐμαῖς; Θεραπεύειν too only occurs once more in a sarcastic remark by the god (932): ἡμεῖς, οἷς σε θεραπεύειν μέλει.

sion.[100] But the rhesis which Pentheus now makes fits more logically with the previous scenes, (the god's prologue, and the scene between Teiresias and Cadmus), than is suggested by any vision of him as the righteous king, or as the puritan driven on by sexual fantasies.

When one looks at Pentheus' reasoning in 216-45, it shows a resemblance to that of Semele's sisters, 26-31. They then said first that Semele was guilty of unlawful sexual behaviour, 28 νυμφευθεῖσαν ἐκ θνητοῦ τινός, secondly that she had indeed claimed that Zeus had been her lover, 29 ἐς Ζῆν' ἀναφέρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λέχους, but, thirdly, the proof of her guilt was provided by Zeus himself, 30 f. ὧν νιν οὕνεκα κτανεῖν Ζῆν'.

Pentheus (and his informants) reason as follows: first, that the Theban women are guilty of desertion from the city (217) and of unnatural orgies and sexual behaviour (221-25); secondly, that they claim they are celebrating the rites of the god Dionysus (221-25), but, thirdly, that the proof of their guilt is provided by the presence among them, day and night, of a seductive Lydian (233-38) and by the fact that Dionysus had previously been burnt to death with his mother (244-45).

In both cases an argument has been constructed that is apparently logical, and which satisfactorily explains all the facts and circumstances.[101] An incorrect assumption has been substantiated by facts wrongly understood.[102] In Pentheus' reasoning the person who provided the assumed proof (as, in the sisters' reasoning, Zeus did in line 31), is split in the double identity of the Lydian stranger and Dionysus, which is so ominous for the action.

The first meaning therefore which must be attached to Pentheus' rhesis 215-47, is that the city of Thebes and her king, Pentheus, are still interpreting the facts that face them about Dionysus in the way that Semele's sisters did in the past, a way which can perhaps be called commonsense. There is no place in it for the divinity of the child. Dionysus, whom Semele bore. For the audience, who are more in the picture than Pentheus and his informants, the dramatic conflict gains in intensity. As previously Zeus' fatal visit to his beloved Semele in the form of the god of thunder and lightning had seemed to confirm precisely that common-sense interpretation of the facts, so the appearance of a Lydian

---

[100] In this way 23-25 (Θῆβας ... ἀνωλόλυξα) takes on a new meaning under the influence of 32-38, in the sense that it appeared that the rites were already being celebrated in Thebes, unwillingly, and under compulsion from the god, see p. 35.

[101] It is worth noting that both Semele's sisters and Pentheus end their argument with the words ὅτι γάμους ἐψεύσατο, 31 and 245; also that the word σοφίσματα is used in the *Bacchae* twice; the sisters call part (ii) of their argument Κάδμου σοφίσματα (30), Pentheus in part (ii) of his argument perceives the stranger's σοφίσματα (489).

[102] Pentheus' accusation of defection is also due to misunderstanding, since it is the god and not the women who are to blame.

stranger seems to confirm this common-sense interpretation of the present facts. The dramatic conflict appears insoluble, because the parties to it are at a stalemate.

In all this those who point out that Pentheus acts from a sense of responsibility for the city are of course right; after all, his function is that of king of Thebes. That good intentions do not save men from the consequences of false judgement, as Dodds remarks (Introd. xliv n.), and that the audience know that Pentheus' judgement is false, does not prevent them from understanding, perhaps some more than others, Pentheus' sharp reaction; this reaction would not label him here purely as a typical tragedy-tyrant,[103] because the king's common sense tells him that the situation in the city has been seriously disturbed by the misbehaviour of the women and of the Lydian stranger. But because Pentheus' common sense falls short in his judgement of this situation he is not above criticism, as a good and righteous king should have been.

On the other hand Pentheus harps on the theme of sexuality, eight lines out of a total of thirty.[104] Is this significant for Pentheus' psychology, as Dodds holds, ad 222-223? I think not. Pentheus and his informants reason by common sense; for them the assumption that the women on Cithaeron are guilty of sexual misconduct (222-25) is proved by the continual presence of a hot-blooded Lydian (235-38). The two passages belong to different parts of the argument, and both are necessary for it. Moreover, as one would expect from the prologue, and from the scene between Teiresias and Cadmus, there is a more obvious explanation of why Pentheus touches upon the subject of sexuality in this way. All the women have left the city, and during the ἡμέρας τε κεὐφρόνας (days and nights) that the Lydian is up there among them, there is a violation of the Thebans' conjugal rights (cf. 353-54).[105] Pentheus here is interpreting the aggrieved mood of the Theban men. There is certainly a participational aspect for the modern reader, in that this interpretation has a humorous effect which relies on our ability to be involved. Surely this applies to the spectators in antiquity too? They did not wonder at this

---

[103] Cf. M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie* (²Göttingen 1954) II, Erläuterungen p. 179 ad S. 455 Z. 15 v.u.

[104] 222-25, 235-38. But perhaps seven, since the meaning of 238 is disputed. Dodds reads a double meaning in προτείνων 'dangling before them his mysteries of joy'. On the other hand Winnington-Ingram, in the light of 218, prefers the translation 'under pretence of Bacchic rites', p. 46 and note. J. Larue (see n. 44) thinks that satyrs' uplifted phalli were displayed in front of the women (p. 211), but satyrs are, of course, nowhere mentioned in the play as being present on Cithaeron: they have their place only in the myth (130). Larue's overextended imagination makes him forget that for Pentheus Dionysus did not exist, let alone satyrs.

[105] Naturally not only sexual, but the whole of social intercourse is disrupted; one only has to think of the domestic problems which βρέφη λιποῦσαι (702) must have caused.

point of the action whether Pentheus is obsessed with curiosity and desire, as Winnington-Ingram believes (p. 46); but they would certainly appreciate Pentheus' indignation, and that of his fellow-males, about the Lydian. So far as their ability to participate could be separated from their knowledge that the sandy-haired young man on Cithaeron was the god Dionysus, they could share the feelings that such a young ruffian should be hanged.[106]

At that point Pentheus sees the old men in their bacchant costumes. 'If Pentheus laughs it is without mirth', Winnington-Ingram rightly remarks (p. 47); it is rather the audience who laugh at Pentheus' discovery that he has delivered his whole tirade in the presence of the two old men who, provided with the attributes demanded by the ritual, are ready to set out for the mountain of fornication. The rhesis of 248-62 speaks for itself; fury and embarrassment ring through 248-54 in every line.[107] 255-60ª contain a traditional reproach against seers (cf. Dodds), but they also reveal something of what can be called character, in the sense that Pentheus with σὺ ταῦτ' ἔπεισας (it is *you* who persuaded him) directs his fury explicitly at Teiresias, and in so doing protects his grandfather. The respect with which he continues to treat Cadmus (250, 252, 254 and cf.n. 107) contrasts here with the crudity of his threats 258-60, directed at the seer. Pentheus finishes his rhesis with a short peroration: γυναιξὶ γὰρ/οὐχ ὑγιὲς οὐδὲν ἔτι λέγω τῶν ὀργίων. (I tell you, there's nothing

---

[106] Line 246 contains the first clear colloquialism in Pentheus' speech, the crude statement: ταῦτ' οὐχὶ δεινῆς ἀγχόνης ἐστ' ἄξια; There will be plenty of expressions from spoken Attic (which need not necessarily all be conversational) from 248 onwards. It is not always easy to indicate the right tone and dramatic meaning of a colloquialism, nor indeed of an accumulation of them, cf. P. T. Stevens, *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*, Wiesbaden 1976, 64ff.—Line 246 certainly expresses indignation and contempt by the meaning of the words themselves. It is true that ἀγχόνη has its literal meaning here (Stevens p. 10), but for this reason δεινῆς particularly strengthens the sentiment: 'hideous noose'. Mau's emendation δεινὰ κἀγχόνης is not justified ('very plausible', comments Dodds, and J. Roux adopts the emendation in her text).

[107] A familiar ἀτάρ (Stevens p. 44) introduces the sudden change of subject (Denn. GP 52). τόδ' ἄλλο θαῦμα (248) expresses, I think, disgust, with its combination of a deictic τόδε with ἄλλο, cf. *Medea* 705 and *Hippolytus* 874; ἐν ποικίλαισι νεβρίσι is meant derisively like the Phrygians' θύλακοι ποικίλοι (*Cyclops* 182), the sight of which enraptured Helen (cf. *Troades* 991-92). The humorous aspect of Pentheus' rage must restrain us from too hasty conclusions about ethnocentric narrow-mindedness or similar attitudes on his part. Contrast the proud πέπλοι ποικίλοι given to Glauce (*Medea* 1159) and worn by Hermione (*Andromache* 148), in both of which cases the poet lets his irony speak for itself.—πολὺν γέλων (250) is again intended derisively; V. di Benedetto (on *Orestes* 1560) thinks that the combination 'non doveva essere estranea alla lingua quotidiana'.—The asyndeton of ἀναίνομαι ... ἔχον (251-52) sounds more dignified. Here respect and indignation strive for precedence, but in 253 indignation wins: οὐκ ἀποτινάξεις κισσόν; οὐκ ... μεθήσεις...; The phraseology is everyday Attic idiom of common origin (R. Kannicht on *Helena* 437-40, with references); the repetition of the idiom highlights the extent of the king's fury.

healthy about rites with women in them). Line 261 is spurious.[108] The coryphaeus expresses her intense alarm with a naked genitive exclamationis: τῆς δυσσεβείας! (Blasphemy!).[109]

The scene continues with a rhesis by Teiresias (266-327) in which the seer defends Dionysus' divinity according to the rules of the art of rhetoric. For clarity, the tone and character of his logic leave nothing to be desired: Teiresias is shown here as a representative, in manner of thought and in method, of fifth-century sophistry, cf. Deichgräber (1935) 331-36. I shall return shortly to look at some parts of Teiresias' argument in the light of Pentheus' reaction.

Cadmus, who speaks after Teiresias (330-42), is not characterized as a typical sophist.[110] Compared with the seer, Cadmus appears to have a narrower outlook: Teiresias keeps the interests of society in view, and the danger that threatens if the god does not receive the respect that is his due, cf. 319-21, 360-63, just as he did in the previous scene, 206-09. Cadmus on the other hand sees primarily a profit for his own House in the recognition of Dionysus' divinity,[111] and hopefully suggests that the

[108] ὅπου βότρυος ἐν δαιτὶ γίγνεται γάνος. R. Y. Tyrrell considered (in 1871) that the line was spurious, but in 1892 he withdrew his rejection. His reasoning for the omission of 261 was not entirely happy, and he was not followed by later editors: 'Uncinis inclusi ut ex v. 380 sumptum; neque enim δαιτί et ὀργίων inter se bene congruunt'. The first argument is rejected by Dodds, ad 384-85, with: 'The echo of 261, βότρυος ἐν δαιτὶ γάνος, is thus intentional, and should not be made a ground for suspecting the authenticity of that line'. Here Tyrrell's and Dodds' arguments cancel each other out, although Dodds does not notice that the meal in 384 is expressis verbis a meal for men, so that an 'intentional echo' is perhaps incorrect. The spuriousness of 261 is, however, shown by the following: (i) βότρυος γάνος has a loftiness of language which is ridiculous coming from Pentheus at this point, particularly just before οὐχ ὑγιὲς οὐδέν, which is generally seen as a familiar expression (J. Smereka I, p. 108; Stevens p. 25, Sandys ad loc.). (ii) ἐν δαιτί is completely appropriate in 383 (ἐν δαιτὶ θεῶν), but here (as Tyrrell saw) is absurd: a meal has an element of sanctity (Nilsson GGR I, 142ff.) and Pentheus could not envisage the women on Cithaeron ἐν δαιτί, nor does he do so (see 221ff.). (iii) When 261 is removed, Pentheus' comment becomes more precise and more biting: 'When women are involved, then, say I, nothing wholesome is left in the mysteries'; τῶν ὀργίων is general. Pentheus' reasoning is: ὄργια are a bad thing for women (cf. 353-54, 675-76) because they drink and have sexual intercourse in them (cf. 218-25, 687-88). His train of thought is not: ὄργια are a bad thing for women as soon as they start to drink, as Paley explains the text. In my opinion 261 is an interpolation. We must therefore consider the interpolator's motive; perhaps he found the statement too crude, or else thought it to be a blasphemy against the two goddesses of the Thesmophoria. A. M. Dale's general comments about interpolation (*Introd. Helena* xxxif.) reassure me that I have here applied criteria which are in principle reliable.

[109] This can be called *paracomedy*, a tragic parody of the language of comedy. Reiske's emendation is correct, see Verdenius; Kannicht on *Helena* 264-66, 1021; Stevens p. 62 note 148.

[110] Σοφός in this episode is used by Cadmus about Teiresias, 179, 186. And it is Teiresias, not Cadmus, who has views on the ἀνὴρ σοφός, 200, 203, 266.

[111] 334-35 καὶ καταψεύδου καλῶς / ὡς ἔστι Σεμέλης LP with Dodds, Verdenius, J. Roux. But I do not believe that 'Dionysus is a god' and 'the god is Semele's child' could for a Greek be two distinct ideas within the frame of the dramatized myth, as Dodds argues:

whole family shall share (336) in the τιμή (honour) which the god demands (and on which Teiresias had laid such stress, 192, 208, 321, cf. 329). But Cadmus naturally addresses his grandson through family feeling; just as Teiresias had remarked on the political implication of Pentheus' rejection of the god (266-71, 319-21), Cadmus comments on the misfortune suffered, when he scorned a god, by his other grandchild, Actaeon (337-42). It is worth noting Cadmus' statement in 331: οἴκει μεθ' ἡμῶν, μὴ θύραζε τῶν νόμων (be at home with us, not outside the law), in which the metaphor οἴκει (be at home with) sounds rather bitter to the audience who know that the whole house of Cadmus has not yet been initiated into Dionysus' service. In the play only the chorus presume so far as to defend this service as νόμος (law);[112] so it seems that Cadmus here too submits himself to the rule of Dionysiac σοφία (wisdom) (compare above p. 39 f.)—although his reward for this (389 ff.: the conformist's tranquil life is not disturbed and keeps the family together) will turn out to be a bitter illusion.

When in 343 Pentheus takes up the dialogue again, his anger has only increased. Cadmus spoke last; in two lines his grandson rejects him rather rudely: 'Dont't touch me—play at being a bacchant if you like, but you can't wipe off your foolishness on me![113] Most of Pentheus' rhesis is directed against Teiresias (7 lines, 345-51) and against the stranger (6 lines, 352-57).

Pentheus' attitude to Teiresias is sacrilegious (cf. Dodds ad 350). What meaning has it for the audience? Opinions differ widely. Deichgräber

---

'Pentheus might accept the first while rejecting the second'. καί here has a reinforcing power in an imperative sense (KG II.248): 'and therefore'; it introduces the conclusion which is the happy result of παρὰ σοὶ λεγέσθω.

[112] See 71, 387, 431, 893-96, 995 = 1015, 997, 1009. On 484 see note 148.

[113] For the colloquial idiom see note 107. Dodds comments: 'Pentheus speaks of Bacchism as if it were a physical infection transmissible by contact (as all forms of pollution were long held to be). His violent horror of such contact is a fine psychological stroke: something in him knows already the fascination and the mortal peril which the new rites hold for him'. These ideas are not supported by a closer examination of the verb ἐξομόργνυμι. It occurs six times in Euripides: *Bacchae* 334, *El.* 502, *Her.* 1399, *Hipp.* 653, *Or.* 219, *Phaeth.* 219 Diggle. V. di Benedetto says (on *Or.* 219): 'ἐξομόργνυμι è un *Lieblingswort*, che Euripide ha, se non coniato, certo introdutto nella lingua letteraria, in sostuzione del più comune ἀπομόργνυμι'. The word is used in the sense of *wiping clean*, without defilement: *El.* 502 (tears), *Or.* 219 (the froth on Orestes' mouth), and probably *Phaeth.* 219, where Clymene instructs her maids to wipe the ground clean on the occasion that a drop of blood from Phaethon's body has fallen there. We certainly find defilement in *Hipp.* 653: Hippolytus must wash his ears in running water because of what he has heard. Heracles, finally, says to Theseus, *Her.* 1399: ἀλλ' αἷμα μὴ σοῖς ἐξομόρξωμαι πέπλοις. Wilamowitz comments: 'der physische Ekel überkommt ihn. An die metaphorische Übertragung der Blutschuld (1233) ist nicht mehr zu denken'—rightly, I think, in the light of πέπλοις. In all cases the meaning is 'wipe off', not 'infect'. This is also the case here in the *Bacchae*, and I paraphrase: 'You cannot clean yourself of your madness by wiping it off on me'. The sarcasm leaves no room for fascination, or for a premonition of mortal danger.

(1935) writes (p. 337): 'der eine [viz. Cadmus] denkt an den Nutzen, den seine Familie von der Sache haben kann, der andere ist der Theologe, der sophistische Dogmatiker der neuen Religion. Indem Euripides dem Pentheus zuerst diese beiden gegenüberstellt, hat er unsere Sympathie in einem nicht unbeträchtlichen Mass für ihn gewonnen'. On the other hand Kirk writes, ad 346-51: 'There is a kind of spitefulness, a total lack of magnanimity, in Pentheus' proposed punishment of Tiresias and in the deliberate and complacent way in which he outlines it. This young man ... is developing early some of the worst qualities of the tyrant, and it is inconceivable to me ... that Euripides does not mean his audience to realize it'. The contrasts are great, but neither of the statements quoted appear to reflect accurately the meaning which Pentheus' attitude had for the audience. The problem lies primarily in the reference: does an act like this, commited by Pentheus against the seer, arouse public horror or public sympathy? Or neither? One must therefore obviously suppress as far as possible one's own reference of sympathy with the defenceless old prophet.

The position of seers and soothsayers in the last decades of the fifth century was not unqualifiedly strong.[114] There are three factors which threatened their influence. The factor which is most obvious to us, because it is best represented in literature, not least in Euripides' own work, is the sophist movement. Criticism of traditional belief in the gods was, however, expressed primarily in intellectual circles, in which ordinary people had little or no part.[115] The second factor is the undermining of belief in oracles and omens as a result of scientific knowledge. This is where the real clash took place, and it 'occurred not in intellectual discussion but in practical life, and consequently it became the business of the whole people. That it was so is proved by the fact that the seers rose up to defend the old religion when they became aware of the danger' (Nilsson, op. cit. 137). The third factor must be looked for within the seers themselves. They had great influence on daily life;[116] but they did not enjoy the unlimited trust of their fellow citizens. Aristophanes'

[114] M. P. Nilsson, *Greek Popular Religion.* (New York 1940) 121ff. E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley 1951): Ch.VI *Rationalism and Reaction in the Classical Age.*

[115] Nilsson, op. cit. 135; Dodds, *The Greeks etc.* 183ff. Their influence upon the minds of ordinary people was perhaps greater than we can appreciate. Euripides gained very few prizes, but he was frequently assigned actors. Plato attaches great value to the aspect of παιδεία in the poet's work (Resp. 376eff.). But Euripides' influence on the man in the street, in so far as criticism of traditional popular religion was concerned, took perhaps quite a different turn from that ever intended by the poet himself. Without intending to, Euripides could not only have provoked the reaction, but also encouraged it towards the stage which Dodds (*The Greeks etc.* 193ff.) calls regression.

[116] Compare Victor Ehrenberg, *The people of Aristophanes* (Oxford 1943, London 1974) 260ff.

mockery of them in the *Knights* and the *Birds* tells us that there were many charlatans among the seers, oracle merchants, and interpreters of dreams, omens, and auspices (Nilsson, op. cit. 132 f.). But even if normal professional problems are left out of the reckoning, the seers were encountering a healthy dose of scepticism among their clients. Dodds (*The Greeks etc.* 202 note 75) draws attention to Euthyphro's complaint (Plato *Euthphr.* 3c): ὅταν τι λέγω ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ περὶ τῶν θείων, προλέγων αὐτοῖς τὰ μέλλοντα, καταγελῶσιν ὡς μαινομένου (whenever I say anything in the assembly about divinity, foretelling the future, they laugh at me as if I were mad). The anecdote about Anaxagoras and Lampon also tells us that the seers sometimes, if only for short periods, found no credibility.[117]

Teiresias as Euripides portrays him is a barrel of contradictions for the audience. He defends the traditional religious values, as becomes a seer (201-09); he expounds the significance of the god attractively (278-85). In 360-63 he shows his responsibility as seer for the welfare of the state. But he constructs his main rhesis (266-327) like an orator who has learnt the tricks of his trade thoroughly from the sophists, particularly in the way in which he meets Pentheus' points in the prooimion (266-71) and in the peroration (319-27). In his approach to Demeter and Dionysus (274-81) he is a modernist like Prodicus (see Dodds ad loc.).

The explanation of the birth-myth is a witty satire by the poet on sophistry, and so also on Teiresias, who gives the impression that he takes his explanation seriously, 287: διδάξω σ' ὡς καλῶς ἔχει τόδε (I will explain to you how elegant this is). Winnington-Ingram has expressed his surprise (p. 50) that in this modern age Sandys, quoting Jebb, described the passage (ad. loc.) as 'a rationalism which, holding to the substance of faith, seeks to purge it of gross accidents'. After all, the myth that we hear from Teiresias is no more elevating, and just as absurd, as the story current among ordinary people about Zeus' thigh. But Winnington-Ingram's explanation of why Teiresias explains the myth in this way is just as hard to accept (1.1.): 'But the theologian's intellectual conscience must somehow be satisfied. So the physically grotesque must go, and for it shall be substituted a vague, plausible and refined explanation, bringing theology into harmony with "modern science"; for "ether" then as

---

[117] Quoted by Nilsson op. cit. 134. Plut. *Pericl.* 6: λέγεται δέ ποτε κριοῦ μονόκερω κεφαλὴν ἐξ ἀγροῦ τῷ Περικλεῖ κομισθῆναι, καὶ Λάμπωνα μὲν τὸν μάντιν, ὡς εἶδε τὸ κέρας ἰσχυρὸν καὶ στερεὸν ἐκ μέσου τοῦ μετώπου πεφυκός, εἰπεῖν ὅτι δυεῖν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει δυναστειῶν, τῆς Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους, εἰς ἕνα περιστήσεται τὸ κράτος παρ' ᾧ γένοιτο τὸ σημεῖον· τὸν δ' Ἀναξαγόραν τοῦ κρανίου διακοπέντος ἐπιδεῖξαι τὸν ἐγκέφαλον οὐ πεπληρωκότα τὴν βάσιν, ἀλλ' ὀξὺν ὥσπερ ᾠὸν ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς ἀγγείου συνωλισθηκότα κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον ὅθεν ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ κέρατος εἶχε τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ τότε μὲν θαυμασθῆναι τὸν Ἀναξαγόραν ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων, ὀλίγῳ δ'ὕστερον τὸν Λάμπωνα, τοῦ μὲν Θουκυδίδου καταλυθέντος, τῶν δὲ τοῦ δήμου πραγμάτων ὁμαλῶς ὑπὸ τῷ Περικλεῖ γενομένων.

in more recent times, was a word to conjure with'.[118] Teiresias would then have delivered a brilliant satire on his own modernity (which he doesn't do—he is taking it seriously), since the game of forfeits played by Zeus and Hera with a bit of αἰθήρ (ether) as stake cannot be a serious attempt to reconcile theology and modern science with each other. What sort of serious speculation could one hope to find in such a story? The dummy Dionysus made of αἰθήρ (ether) was given to Hera as ὅμηρος (hostage), clearly to be destroyed by her, the next time Zeus puts a foot wrong.[119] Teiresias offers Pentheus this grotesque tale of deceit in his

---

[118] Cf. A. Lesky, *Die trag. Dichtung*³ 488: '...hier sollte man nicht ohne weiteres von einer Rationalisierung des Mythos sprechen. Teiresias bleibt mit dem tötendem Blitz des Zeus und der Eifersucht Heras durchaus auf dem Boden der Tradition, er such nur einen allzu unglaubwürdigen Zug zu beseitigen'. But in fact, the way in which he does this is to use a sophist style, and it cannot be compared—as Lesky does—with Pindar *O.* 1,30ff.

[119] The text of 292-94 cannot, unless one assumes a lacuna, be emended satisfactorily, cf. Dodds. Willink (I, p. 40) defends Dalmeyda's suggestion of διάλυσιν for Διόνυσον, and reads:

ἔθηκε, τόνδ' ὅμηρον ἐκδιδούς,
διάλυσιν Ἥρας νεικέων.

However, (i) it seems unlikely that the words ἔθηκε τόνδ' ὅμηρον do not belong together; (ii) νιν in 294 really remains incomprehensible. In Teiresias' διδαχή (cf. 287) here one would have expected above all else a clear distinction between the real Dionysus and the Aether-Dionysus. I find even less acceptable M. Gronewald's suggestion ZPE 19 (1975) 304: Διάλυσον for Διόνυσον, ex Corn. *Nat. Deorum* 30: ὡσανεὶ Διάλυσος κεκλημένος. — I think that Euripides stressed the contrast between the two Dionysi clearly, and wrote something like:

ῥήξας μέρος τι τοῦ χθόν' ἐγκυκλουμένου
αἰθέρος, ἔθηκε τόνδ' ὅμηρον ἐκδιδοὺς 293
< Ἥρας σπαραγμῷ· τὸν δ'ἐτήτυμον γόνον 293a
ἐρρύσαθ'> Ἥρας νεικέων. 294

The second half of the lost line (compare here S. *Tr.* 1064) was possibly explained in the margin: Διόνυσον. The gloss slipped into the text, and confused the copyist, who after Διόνυσον Ἥρας went on in the wrong place. The insertion e.g. Ἥρας σπαραγμῷ seems rather heavily charged with meaning for the *Bacchae* (cf. 735). But what else should Hera have done with this piece of aether? Dodds' suggestion that she threw it out of heaven, and that it is the ξύλον that was revered in Thebes as Dionysus Cadmeius (Paus. 9.12.14) seems to me unlikely. In any case Hera must have done something with the dummy Dionysus. One can perhaps suppose that Teiresias is referring here to Dionysus being torn to pieces by the Titans. If so the seer, in the same way that he had assigned the sacred story of the god's birth from the marrow of the king of heaven (cf. Dodds ad 88-98) to the realm of legend, could have offered this Orphic dogma as an airy heavenly variant (or pendant). Naturally this must be considered as uncertain conjecture, although the grounds for it probably existed for Euripides and his public: (a) the myth of Dionysus' διασπασμός is generally accepted as very old (cf. Nilsson GGR I 686); (b) Hera's hatred of the child Dionysus is one of the basic assumptions of the play. In any case we find (a) and (b) associated with each other at a much later period, for example in Nonnus *Dionys.* 6.171, and cf. Orph. *Fr.* 210 Kern. But even within the scope of the *Bacchae*, a sparagmos of the Aether-Dionysus could have been mentioned in a way appropriate to the occasion, since the god is shortly to repeat his father's trick on Pentheus, 629-31, when the king will (according to the god) fall into a wild rage, ὡς σφάζων ἐμέ, 'as if he were trying to slaughter me'.

function of prophet, ἐξηγητής (expounder) of an esoteric truth (Sandys-Jebb, 1.1.). 'Doubtless Teiresias was pleased with his punning sophistry', Winnington-Ingram rightly says, but the audience also see how the poet mocks at this sort of sophistry.

Finally Teiresias suggests (314-18) that there is no connection between Dionysus and Aphrodite;[120] but his suggestion is a recognizable piece of sophistry for all his audience.[121]

The contradictions which Euripides has introduced into the character of Teiresias have a great advantage for the dramatic action he wishes to create. It is desirable from the point of view of the action that the protagonist and the antagonist give expositions of their point of view in the *agon*, but obviously Euripides does not want the stranger— behind whom the god himself is hiding—to chop logic with Pentheus in a formal debate (the stranger's role gains its stature in another way, as shall appear in the next episode). As Pentheus' antagonist the poet therefore picks Teiresias, and to a lesser extent Cadmus. But Teiresias defends Dionysus' service with arguments which hardly touch upon Pentheus' common sense reasoning: he dodges the question of the woman's behaviour with a reference to φύσις (nature),[122] he says nothing of the stranger, and in response to the positive opinion held by Semele's sisters and by Pentheus that Dionysus had been destroyed in Zeus' lightning flash he offers a fairy tale about Zeus and Hera. So the clash between Pentheus and Teiresias ends with the performance of an act (the desecration of Teiresias' seat) that hardly touches upon the fringes of the relationship between the two adversaries of the next three episodes. The Teiresias scene is therefore a more or less disconnected event within the course of the action; nothing that has been said or done in this scene is referred to again, so far as Teiresias' part in it is concerned;[123] on the other hand Cadmus' part in the scene has a function in the exodos.

---

[120] Dionysus is the god of euphrosyne (see chapter 6) and one of the aspects of this is that he is connected with sensual desires; there is perhaps an earlier reference in Sappho *Fr.* 17.10 L.-P. Cf. for example Anacreon 357 PMG, and Ion. Lyr. 744 PMG, where he is called: ἥδιστον πρόπολον βαρυγδούπων ἐρώτων. According to Hesychius the poetess Praxilla called him the son of Aphrodite, 752 PMG.

[121] To the audience the relationship is evident. Dionysus cannot help it if a woman's behaviour lacks chastity. Equally Aphrodite cannot help it if anyone (Hippolytus) behaves chastely.

[122] 315-16: ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει / τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἔνεστιν εἰς τὰ πάντ' ἀεί. Read a full stop after ἀεί, cf. Verdenius' defense of ἔνεστιν = 'depends on', and his explanation of ἀεί: 'in each case' (or, better, 'at any particular time', as Dodds translates ἀεί in Pl. *Gorg.* 480 c ad loc.).

[123] Here I have the action in mind and not the choruses. Deichgräber has suggested an (implausible) relationship between these last and the Teiresias-Cadmus scene, see note 98.

What descriptive aspect of meaning then has Pentheus' attitude? If Euripides wished to bring home to the audience Pentheus' character of tyranny and hubris it is incomprehensible that he would portray a Teiresias who lacked the dignity and prestige of a prophet. If he wished primarily to direct the audience's sympathy towards Pentheus, then the appropriate means of doing so would have been to let him send the seer up the mountain like an old fool (just as he did his grandfather), and not to let Pentheus commit a desecration. But Euripides followed neither of these paths, and we must therefore draw the conclusion that he was not by this desecration aiming at characterizing Pentheus either positively or negatively. Apollo's priest makes common cause with the new cult, and does so to the detriment of the god whose prophet he is (298-301, 306-09). Where the king finds evil, he takes action: Dionysus still does not exist, the cult is no cult, but misconduct, and the city is harmed by it. The poet has ingeniously avoided the risk that the desecration might make Pentheus an abject opponent of the god, by giving the seer some of the traits of a charlatan side by side with his sincere feeling of concern for the city. On the other hand 345, like 255, certainly has the intention of making Pentheus sympathetic: τῆς σῆς ἀνοίας τόνδε τὸν διδάσκαλον δίκην μέτειμι (I will deal with this teacher of your foolishness). In spite of the fact that Pentheus was probably aware that Semele's story about her pregnancy was Κάδμου σοφίσματα (Cadmus' sophistries) (30), he ascribes this foolishness not to Cadmus but to Teiresias, and in so doing reveals that one of his own characteristics is respect, if not devotion, for his grandfather.[124] On the participational level, it is perhaps a moving aspect of the action that grandfather and grandson, each, in his own way and from irreconcilably opposed ideas, try to hold on to family solidarity.

Finally Pentheus gives instructions for the stranger to be arrested and brought before him, 352-57. Here is a direct link back to 247; in the hundred or so lines intervening nothing has been said of the stranger. It is evident that Pentheus' attention to the problems of Theban family life is undiminished: ἐξιχνεύσατε/τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον, ὃς ἐσφέρει νόσον/καινὴν γυναιξὶ καὶ λέχη λυμαίνεται (find me that effeminate stranger, carrying a new disease for women, who defiles their beds).

There is an element of comedy in the variety of punishments which Pentheus in his anger is continually suggesting for the stranger. After beheading (240-41), and hanging (246), he suggests stoning (356-57). Later he will be satisfied to have the stranger imprisoned, in order to

[124] That Pentheus' manner towards Cadmus must be credited with these emotional values is naturally confirmed with hindsight by 1308-22; or, better expressed, the affection which Pentheus displays for Cadmus in the first episode is a prelude to make more poignant the pathos of 1308-22, cf. p. 98.

unlearn his so-called rites (497, 509-11). No typical tyrant speaks here, but wounded male pride, wishing to make his foreign rival, who is so obviously irresistible, pay for his improper conduct.[125]

The second episode (424-518)

In 434 the stranger is led bound before the king, and there is the first conversation between the two of them. The audience has been led by what has happened so far to expect the answers to two questions, and their expectations are once more brought to the centre of attention by the arrival of the god/stranger in his bonds: first, how will Dionysus play his role of being both god and man at the same time, and how will he bring to fruition the task that he has set himself: φανέντα θνητοῖς δαίμονα (revealing his godhead to men) (42)? Secondly, what will Pentheus do, now that he has the source of all the trouble in his power?

The scene opens with a rhesis by the soldier who arrested the stranger. After saluting the king he continues with two separate items of news: the stranger let himself be arrested, laughing, and without resistance (436-42); the women whom Pentheus had had confined have escaped in some miraculous way (443-48). The soldier ends with two lines, in which in guarded language he expresses his doubt that common sense will be adequate in dealing with the problem that faces them.[126]

Pentheus orders the stranger to be released from his bonds.[127] His 'he

---

[125] 356f. ὡς ἂν λευσίμου δίκης τυχὼν / θάνῃ, πικρὰν βάκχευσιν ἐν Θήβαις ἰδών. Euripides uses the word βάκχευσις only here; the meaning is sarcastic: 'a bacchant's life'. πικρὰν ... ἰδών: the expression is derived from colloquial speech, cf. Fraenkel on A. *Ag*. 606, p. 301 note 1; Barrett on *Hipp*. 725-27. It is not included in Smereka's and Steven's list of colloquialisms. The god answers the sarcastic note in 634: συντεθράνωται δ' ἅπαν / πικροτάτους ἰδόντι δεσμοὺς τοὺς ἐμούς, and, more grimly in 815: ὅμως δ' ἴδοις ἂν ἡδέως ἅ σοι πικρά;

[126] πολλῶν δ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ θαυμάτων ἥκει πλέως / ἐς τάσδε Θήβας· σοὶ δὲ τἄλλα χρὴ μέλειν. γ' for δ' in 449 (Herwerden, accepted by J. Roux) is unnecessary, cf. Verdenius. Δέ introduces the conclusion (Denn. GP 170).

[127] Two problems arise in 451-52: (i) For μαίνεσθε all modern editors accept Burges' μέθεσθε. This does not entirely solve the problem of the text as transmitted, since the use of the middle here is suspect: the soldiers are not ordered to let go of the prisoner's hands, but to unshackle him; so Pentheus would be saying: μέθετε χέρας, cf. *IT* 468. J. Roux has recognized the problem, but I doubt if her solution is acceptable: 'Ce verbe suggère, me semble-t-il, que les gardes n'ont déféré qu'à la seconde invitation de l'étranger (439): au lieu d'enchaîner leur prisonnier, rassurés peut-être par son attitude conciliante, ils se sont contentés de le saisir par les bras'. Besides, Madame Roux forgets 355 δέσμιον. Another solution is: the stranger is indeed shackled, but is *in addition* held by the soldiers, who must now let him go. This is not an attractive solution, since the stranger would then have been condemned to an enforced lack of gestures for the whole episode. (ii) There is a problem of dramaturgy, set out by Verrall (p. 61 note): 'To drop μαίνεσθε makes Pentheus pass in silence the escape of the bacchanals and the man's miraculous explanation. Drama, if not reality, requires that he should take some notice of it'. Verrall suggests that there is a lacuna in the text, which he fills by, for example:

can't escape me' is inconsistent with what the soldier has just said (439), but the audience understand the satisfaction that Pentheus feels, now that things have taken a turn for the better.[128] Moreover the poet has added irony to the dramatic situation which the audience, faced with Pentheus' satisfaction, also appreciate: the first dark clouds are already beginning to gather over Pentheus' head (θαυμάτων ἥκει πλέως (he has come full of wonders), 449).[129]

Before the interrogation begins, the king praises the stranger's beauty; 453-59. This is a key passage, on which rests the psychological interpretation that Euripides wishes to reveal a suppressed sensuality in Pentheus, which in combination with an almost Dionysiac lust for power, will be the cause of his downfall.

But the first and most obvious meaning of 453 ff. is that the description of the stranger which Pentheus had heard (235-36), appears to have been correct. Pentheus' common sense reasoning (see p. 41) had recognized as fact the past data about Dionysus (244: ὃς ἐκπυροῦται λαμπάσιν κεραυνίαις (who was burnt up by heavenly fires)). The present information about the Lydian has now, Pentheus states with satisfaction, also been confirmed: the Lydian does indeed prove to have an amorous appearance.[130]

μαίνεσθε· <χειρῶν τοὔργον· ἀλλὰ νῦν ὅμως
μέθεσθε> χειρῶν τοῦδ'· ἐν ἄρκυσιν κτλ.

Dodds: 'This is plausible; but having laid hands on the principal, Pentheus may perhaps be allowed to neglect the subordinates'. Dodds' solution is supported by the motive we found for the action of the first episode: now that the stranger is caught, thinks Pentheus, the women will find their escapade decidedly less attractive. Moreover, as spectators we will notice that in the action Pentheus never reacts to a miracle: miracles do not seem to exist for him.

When we look at problems (i) and (ii) together, I doubt whether μαίνεσθε is simply a corruption of μέθεσθε, originally caused by the general confusion between ε and αι, which were pronounced in the same way from Hellenistic times. In L the line is written:

μαίνεσθε, χειρῶν τοῦδ' ἐν ἄρκυσιν γὰρ ὤν.

Perhaps this is the laborious result (poor grammar: γάρ, and obscure meaning: τοῦδ' for ἐμοῦ) of a desperate attempt to solve the problem of Pentheus' silence about the news that the women had escaped. We must then perhaps emend more drastically, and write:

μέθετε χέρας τοῦδ'· ὡς ἐμαῖς ἐν ἄρκυσιν.

The imperative is then followed in a normal way by ὡς, as in 672, 770, 851, 1288.

[128] Winnington-Ingram, p. 74, differs: 'There is only one explanation: he has never heard the soldier's words at all, so intent has he been upon the figure of the captive'. Such an absent-minded fascination seems to me impossible to stage in a Greek theatre.

[129] E. R. Schwinge takes no account of the dramatic situation, when he explains (p. 345) the inconsistency between 439 and 452: 'Der König also ist nicht fähig, auch nur einen der von dem Diener gemachten Hinweise auf die Wahrheit wenigstens aufzunehmen. Er hört die Worte, und er hört sie nicht. Er beachtet nichts und stellt nichts in Rechnung'. For Pentheus there is only one account which has to be paid: ὃς ἐσφέρει νόσον / καινὴν γυναιξὶ καὶ λέχη λυμαίνεται, 353-54.

[130] Schwinge believes that Pentheus is obstinate, although Teiresias has refuted Pentheus' opinion that the rites lead the women on to sexual behaviour (p. 345). But there

A second meaning, which like the first belongs to the descriptive aspect, concerns the characterization of Pentheus. What, from the psychological point of view, could be a happier idea for Euripides to light on than that the king, now that he imagines that the chief criminal is in his power, should pay him a friendly compliment?[131] 'Indeed, you are a handsome fellow (τὸ μὲν σῶμ' οὐκ ἄμορφος εἶ 453)—that should get you far with the women! (ὡς ἐς γυναῖκας 454).'[132]

There is yet a third aspect of meaning, which should perhaps be called referential, although this meaning is most obvious on the participational level. This aspect arises particularly from the fact that Dionysus is among other things a god of sensual desires. His appearance in the action of the *Bacchae* has something of the character of an epiphany, since the audience know, and are conscious all the time, that the stranger is the god Dionysus.[133] A confrontation with the stranger is for Pentheus a confrontation with the Dionysiac καλλονή (beauty): a softer emotion, a more sensuous consciousness affects him, as it did the soldier who had to arrest the stranger.[134] Both react in the way appropriate to them: the soldier with a feeling of embarrassment and professional matter-of-factness,[135] Pentheus with the mockery of someone who feels that he has the whip hand. But the experience of sensual beauty has a wider effect than producing a typical reaction in Pentheus or the soldier; the audience too are affected by this experience. They experience a tension, produced by Pentheus' confrontation with the god, and by his reaction to a divine manifestation. It is remarkable that attention has previously been paid to the attraction

---

was no question of refutation, either for Pentheus because Teiresias' argument in 314-18 was sophistry, nor in particular for the audience, because they have the additional reference of Διόνυσος ἱμερόεις. Cf. n. 120.

[131] The idea is, I think, Euripides' own; as a contrast compare Lycurgus' coarseness in Aeschylus *Edoni, fr.* 61N[2] ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις; and fr. 62N[2] μακροσκελὴς μὲν ἄρα μὴ χλούνης τις ᾖ. Deichgräber (Nachr. Göttingen, Ph.-hist. Kl. NF III, 8 (1939) p. 251) translates χλούνης with 'ein Verschnittener', but possibly (cf. Wilamowitz, *Aesch.Interpr.* 219) it is ὁ σφριγῶν, ὁ βινῶν.

[132] Dodds takes ὡς as limitative: 'to a woman's taste, at least'. This strikes a false note in Pentheus' eulogy (see below). I think ὡς marks an intention here (LSJ s.v. C II), cf. S.*Aj.* 44: ἦ καὶ τὸ βούλευμ' ὡς ἐπ' Ἀργείοις τόδ' ἦν; and Kamerbeek's note ad loc. As a matter of fact, intentional ὡς is always found with verbs of action; so it is nice to see that Pentheus, unconsciously but in fact accurately, understands the stranger's handsomeness to be the result of a deliberate act, not of a natural gift.

[133] The epiphanic character of Dionysus' appearance in the action is examined in chapter 8. For 453ff. see p. 141.

[134] 436 ὁ θὴρ δ' ὅδ' ἡμῖν πρᾶος. In Pentheus (455-56) the long locks which hang closely down beside his cheeks, and are not bound up behind (cf. J. Roux ad loc.) produce an idea of πόθος.

[135] Embarrassment 441: κἀγὼ δι' αἰδοῦς εἶπον. Professional matter-of-factness 440: τοὐμὸν εὐτρεπὲς ποιούμενος. εὐτρεπές is Canter's sure emendation for εὐπρεπές LP.

which an Hippolytus had for the public,[136] but that no-one has suggested similar consequences for the role of Pentheus, although he has barely left his youth behind him.[137] But this youth is not confronted with the vehement desperate passion of an adult woman, but is looking at the smiling face of a god, a god who in the perceptions of the audience is supreme when it comes to the sweet beauty of a young man. Pentheus stands here before the ἄδαμον παῖδα ταυρωπόν, νέον οὐ νέον, ἥδιστον πρόπολον βαρυγδούπων ἐρώτων, 'unbroken bull-eyed boy, young but not young, sweetest minister of the loud roaring loves' (Ion Lyr. 744 PMG). The stranger's appearance arouses a sensual emotion in the king, and the audience share this emotion through the way in which they watch Pentheus react to it. The emotion can be called erotic, or romantic, or what you will, but one must beware of imposing on it one's own opinion about these emotions. It is therefore a great impediment to the understanding of the play to call Pentheus a dark puritan, or to suppose that 'his poet is determined that last impressions of him, like first, shall be of unrealised sexual preoccupation, of dark forces working in the dark' (Winnington-Ingram, p. 47), unless one explains from exactly what point of view the fifth-century Athenians would have called Pentheus a puritan, or whether they would have characterized his puritanism as 'dark', and so on.[138]

From the descriptive, participational and referential aspects of meaning of 453-59, outlined above, it seems most likely that Euripides did not give Pentheus a character of repressed sensuality, nor did he intend any suggestion of 'individual sexual prurience' (Kirk ad loc.) for him. Such qualities should only be attributed if the audience realized that something of the sort might apply to the king, but the audience savour the humour of the scene, because they can share in the pleasure that Pentheus feels with his catch. They perceive how the plot hangs together, because Pentheus' reasoning is confirmed. Through their greater knowledge of the real relationships, they realize the futility of Pentheus' resistance. And these feelings and perceptions produce a build-up of emotion, the acknowledgement of an ideal beauty, the sensation of πόθος (desire), which links actors and public.

---

[136] Cf. Grube (1941) 19: 'It is perhaps difficult for us to realize how that virginal young man was to an Athenian audience as romantic a figure as any maiden could be to us'.

[137] 1185ff.: νέος ὁ μόσχος· ἄρτι γένυν ὑπὸ κόρυθ' ἁπαλότριχα κατάκομον θάλλει. Cf. Dodds ad τὸν νεανίαν, 973-76. Madame Roux also comments on the youthfulness of the Pentheus character, cf. her index p. 658 s.v. 'Penthée'.

[138] It is clear that when Dodds calls Pentheus a dark puritan (ad 222-23) he does not use the word in the sense of Empedocles' puritanism, as he had examined it in his *The Greeks and the Irrational* 139ff.

The king's interrogation begins in 460 with a stichomythia which (apart from 461-62) lasts until 508. The last ten lines of the episode consist of two short rheses of six and four lines each, spoken respectively by Pentheus and by Dionysus. The stichomythia falls into two parts: 460-91 in which Pentheus, as interrogator, has the first and last word, and in which he finally abandons his enquiries with ὡς θρασὺς ὁ βάκχος κοὐκ ἀγύμναστος λόγων (how bold is the bacchant—and experienced in argument), and 492-508 in which Dionysus takes the initiative and it is Pentheus who reacts to what the stranger says.[139]

In his interrogation Pentheus tries to check on the other information which he had received (= 233-34 + 237-38) about the stranger. After the stranger has confirmed that he comes from Lydia (233-34 ~ 462-64), Pentheus asks his next question about 'these rites' (τελετὰς τάσδε) following on 238 τελετὰς προτείνων εὐίους νεάνισιν (offering Bacchic initiations to young girls). He wants to hear from the stranger himself what he has to say about his rites, and it is obvious that as a result of what he has heard, and now sees, the word τελεταί (rites) has a sexual connotation for the king. From the point of view of the stranger the connotation is religious; the misunderstanding gives its comic quality to the dialogue.[140]

The first clash comes in 465-66. Pentheus asks: πόθεν δὲ τελετὰς τάσδ' ἄγεις ἐς Ἑλλάδα; 'What made you bring these rites to Greece?' The question expresses surprise that when the stranger left Lydia, he brought his rites with him to Greece: isn't there more than enough sexual pleasure to

---

[139] Schwinge suggests another analysis (p. 342 n. 1), in which he also distinguishes two parts, but with the division after 488. But a division after 491 is more acceptable for the dramatic composition. The action of a play is divided into *dramatic segments*. A dramatic segment is described by Beckerman (op. cit. p. 56ff.) as an organic unity, i.e. a unity defined by activity, to which there is a 'precipitating context' and whose action follows a curve of 'becoming, crux, decrescence'. The actions of the characters within a dramatic segment are directed towards a goal, something which does not yet exist, and which must be brought into existence. Beckerman calls this a *project*: 'the project is the concrete focal point of a character's energy, and it is the project that the performer enacts' (p. 71). He visualizes the functioning of such a dramatic segment as being part of a more general concept, the *theatrical segment*. For example the art of the circus acrobat is also theatrical. Thus the performance of a high wire dancer is such a theatrical segment, the 'precipitating context' comprises the height, the tension, the direction of the wire used by the dancer, the various factors affecting his use of it, etc. The 'project' is the imaginary point on which the high wire dancer concentrates his attention. Compare the situation in a play (p. 72): 'dramatic progression is a product of the proportion between strength of motivation and the directionality of motivation'.—The passage with which we are concerned 460-518, therefore offers us two dramatic segments: 460-91 Pentheus feels himself called to test the truth of the facts he has heard about the stranger, and the poet's dramatic composition is directed towards the complete failure of this attempt (491); in 492-518 Pentheus is invited by the stranger to think up punitive measures, and the poet's dramatic composition is directed towards their fulfilment.

[140] In 465-91 part of the comic effect is the very intention of the stranger *that* he should be wrongly understood (466, 474, 486).

be found in Lydia?[141] The strangers answers: Διόνυσος αὐτός μ' εἰσέβησ', ὁ τοῦ Διός, 'Dionysus himself initiated me, the son of Zeus'.[142] The answer is ambiguous, but not in the sense that one should understand either εἰς τὰς τελετάς (to the rites) or εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα (to Greece).[143] It is made ambiguous by the word εἰσέβησε, 'initiated' which gives Pentheus the opportunity to pervert the meaning of: μ' εἰσέβησ' εἰς τὰς τελετάς into 'Dionysus himself, son of Zeus, taught me the rites of his lusts.[144] The stranger's

[141] For δέ in Pentheus' question (and in all his subsequent questions, except 477), cf. Denn. GP 173: 'The speaker proceeds from the known to the unknown, and δέ denotes that the information he already possesses is inadequate'. That Lydian women, or rather eastern women in general, were generous providers of sexual pleasure, was a self-evident truth for Athenians. They probably had this reputation thanks to the fact that many slave girls from those parts worked in brothels as πόρναι, cf. Ar. *Eccl.* 718-20, where the women passed a law, in their fear of sexual competition, which was aimed at the hetaerae and the slave girls. See references in Ussher ad loc., and cf. V. Ehrenberg *The People of Aristophanes* 152. Also relevant are two love poems by the poets Antimachus and Lamynthius (Ath. XIII 596f-597a) which bear the title Λυδή. Anacreon thought up a new word: λυδοπαθής (Ath. XV 690b-c, 481 PMG, mentioned by the scholiast on A. *Pers.* 42 in a commentary on ἀβροδιαίτων), but perhaps he had a wider meaning in mind of 'luxury', 'pleasant life', cf. Xenophanes *Vorsokr.*[5] 21 B 3: ἀβροσύνας δὲ μαθόντες ἀνωφελέας παρὰ Λυδῶν. Sappho implicitly praises the beauty of Lydian women in *Fr.* 96.6 L.-P. (BKT v (2) 1907 P. Berol. 9722, 5): νῦν δὲ Λύδαισιν ἐμπρέπεται γυναίκεσσιν ὥς ποτ' ἀελίω δύντος ἀ βροδοδάκτυλος μήνα πάντα περρέχοισ' ἄστρα. The Lydian customs recounted by Herodotus (i.94), whatever their origin may have been, certainly did not sound pleasant to Athenian ears: Λυδοὶ δὲ νόμοισι μὲν παραπλησίοισι χρέωνται καὶ Ἕλληνες, χωρὶς ἢ ὅτι τὰ θήλεα τέκνα καταπορνεύουσι.

[142] This was very probably the reading of P. Ant. 24, see Dodds. The variant αὐτός μ' (ἡμᾶς LP) is more attractive; εἰσέβησ' (εὐσέβησ' LP) was previously assumed by Abresch.

[143] Dodds rightly opts for εἰς τὰς τελετάς. Schwinge p. 348 n. 2 opts for εἰς Ἑλλάδα, because this is a more appropriate answer to Pentheus' question. But in this case the sentence can only mean (cf. n. 153): 'Dionysus put me on a ship for Greece'. This answer would be as funny as it would be peculiar. J. Roux translates 465: 'D'où les tiens-tu, ces initiations que tu apportes en Grèce?' But πόθεν ἄγεις ... cannot, I think, stand for παρὰ τίνος παραλαβὼν ἄγεις, as she suggests in her commentary.

[144] εἰσβαίνειν normally means *enter*: a house, a room, a ship, or a vehicle. The same is true of the causative form, since Homer (*Il.* 1.310, cf. *Alc.* 1055). The word is used metaphorically by Sophocles, *OC* 997: τοιαῦτα μέντοι καὐτὸς εἰσέβην κακά, / θεῶν ἀγόντων. Cf. A. *Supp.* 470, and with an inversion of the subject and the object, Soph. *Tr.* 298 and Eur. *Hyps. Fr.* I. iv. 19: κἀμὲ γὰρ τὸ δυσχερὲς / τοῦτ' εἰσβέβηκεν. In this metaphorical use the meaning is always unfavourable (ἄτης ἄβυσσον πέλαγος in A. *Supp.*, οἶκτος δεινός in Soph. *Tr.*). I think that Euripides uses εἰσβιβάζειν (which in any case is not κύριον for 'initiate') deliberately here to give Pentheus (and the audience) the opportunity to accept: Διόνυσος αὐτός μ' εἰσέβησ', ὁ τοῦ Διός, in an unfavourable sense, because for Pentheus the word τελεταί stands for sexual misbehaviour. One must also bear in mind that βαίνω (LSJ s.v. II.1), ἀναβαίνω (LSJ s.v. II.7) and βιβάζω were used in the sense of 'cover', or 'mate' when referring to animals (Herodotus i.192). Comedy extends this usage to include human coupling, e.g. Ar. *Fr.* 329: ἀναβῆναι τὴν γυναῖκα βούλομαι, (but this usage may possibly go back to Anacreon 395.12 PMG). In Ar. *Av.* 207 εἰσβαίνειν is used like this with a double meaning: ἀλλ' ἀντιβολῶ σ' ἄγ' ὡς τάχιστ' εἰς τὴν λόχμην / εἴσβαινε κἀνέγειρε τὴν ἀηδόνα, cf. Jeffrey Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* 136. (λόχμη here implies (cf. *Lys.* 800) the pubic region). Euripides embodied this meaning of εἰσβιβάζω in the stranger's answer to Pentheus' question; this is reinforced by ἠνάγκασεν in 469, which is, in Pentheus' mouth, sarcastic, cf. Dodds ad loc.: Pentheus 'believes that the Stranger has come to Thebes not in obedience to a religious "call", but to gratify his lust'.

reply therefore consists of three answers that are relevant from Pentheus' point of view. First Pentheus finds in the reply a confirmation of 237-38: ὃς ἡμέρας τε κεὐφρόνας συγγίγνεται/τελετὰς προτείνων εὐίους νεάνισιν (who days and nights keeps company with them, offering Bacchic initiations to young girls); secondly he hears a confirmation of 242-43: ἐκεῖνος εἶναί φησι Διόνυσον θεόν,/ἐκεῖνος ἐν μηρῷ ποτ' ἐρράφθαι Διός (He says that Dionysus is a god, he says that he was once sewn up in the thigh of Zeus); and thirdly he can accept 466 as a satisfactory answer to his question in 465, because he knows the Κάδμου σοφίσματα (Cadmus' sophistries, 30), which claim that Dionysus was born here in Greece as son to Zeus: so he can understand why the stranger, as an adept in the Dionysiac rites, would see it as his task to import these sort of rites into Greece.

In his next question Pentheus first chooses to react to the second and third of the stranger's answers. He replies to the second by the sarcasm of his question; and by ἐκεῖ (there) he puts the stranger right with respect to the third: people may think in Lydia that Zeus begets new gods, but they don't in Greece. The stranger replies by simply repeating the Κάδμου σοφίσματα (Cadmus' sophistries).[145] Pentheus now directs the enquiry towards the first element of the stranger's answer in 466, but like a good examining magistrate he continues to refer to the stranger's belief in the god, however absurd he thinks it, and however much he shows this by his jeering use of language.[146] His question about the νύκτωρ ἢ κατ' ὄμμα (at night or when you could see him) (469) is, apart from continuing with the subject of τελεταί (rites), a question about how much authority the ἀνάγκασμα ('compulsion') had (see Dodds), and the stranger understands the king's meaning perfectly. His answer may be paraphrased: 'it had great authority (ὁρῶν ὁρῶντα)—and now I suppose you want to know about the rites (καὶ δίδωσιν ὄργια).'

Next Pentheus poses a number of questions directed at obtaining

---

[145] Pap. Ant. confirmed Canter's correction of LP, 468: οὔκ, ἀλλὰ Σεμέλην ἐνθάδ' ἔζευξεν γάμοις.

[146] Schwinge argues repeatedly (p. 346, 348, 349, 350, 353, 356) that Pentheus asks his questions 'aus reinen Interesse und gänzlich zweckfreier Neugier'. I believe that the examination of the audience's response to the action so far has completely refuted this assumption: Pentheus wants confirmation from the stranger of what he has heard about him before he determines his punishment. However, Schwinge also links to his assumption, which we must consider an incorrect one, a conclusion about Pentheus' *character*, which is fundamental to his interpretation of the whole play. I am convinced that this conclusion is not tenable. He says (p. 350): 'Ist dies [i.e. Schwinge's assumption quoted above] aber richtig, dann wird man nicht mehr an der Erklärung festhalten dürfen, dass Pentheus die Existenz des Gottes jetzt nur als hypothetische Grösse behandelt. Denn niemand richtet seine Neugier auf etwas, von dessen Nichtexistenz er überzeugt ist. Der König vielmehr—dieser Schluss ist kaum vermeidbar—lässt jetzt diejenige Seite seines Wesens zu Worte kommen, die, vorsichtig gesagt, mit der Existenz des Gottes immerhin rechnet'.

details of the rites, but this time the stranger leaves him no wiser: 471 τίς ἰδέα; (what sort of?), Dionysus: you may not know; 473 τίς ὄνησις; (what's in it for you?), Dionysus: you may not hear; 477 ποῖός τις ὁ θεὸς ἦν; (what sort of god?). Dionysus: ὁποῖος ἤθελε (what he wanted). With this last question the king is clearly put on the defensive; since he is getting no information about the rites, he goes back to a point on which the stranger did answer him: 466 Διόνυσος αὐτός μ' εἰσέβησε (Dionysus himself initiated me). But in 478 Pentheus again gets a dusty answer to his question about the god, and the stranger makes play with his double identity: ὁποῖος ἤθελ'· οὐκ ἐγὼ ᾽τασσον τόδε (what he wanted, I didn't order it).[147] At the same time the stranger becomes more aggressive in his attitude to the king; until now he has defended his silence by appealing to the sanctity of the rites, but in 480 he calls Pentheus ἀμαθής (ignorant). Here the god refers back to the charges which he had previously laid upon Thebes; there has been no mention of μάθησις (learning) in the play since 39. The king is even more restrained in his next question, which is almost on the level of self-defence, 481 ἦλθες δὲ πρῶτα δεῦρ' ἄγων τὸν δαίμονα; (Did you first come to bring the god here?) The stranger's answer is proud and self-confident: πᾶς ἀνχορεύει βαρβάρων τάδ' ὄργια. (Every foreigner dances in these rites).

Pentheus, strictly on the defensive, justifies himself with a platitude which sounded less arrogant to Athenian ears than it does to ours: φρονοῦσι γὰρ κακίον Ἑλλήνων πολύ, 'yes, for they have much less sense than Greeks'. But now the god plays the Lydian, and corrects Pentheus, 484: τάδ' εὖ γε μᾶλλον· [οἱ νόμοι δὲ διάφοροι], 'In this case more; [but customs differ]'. The second half of the line (in which one would expect the god to give a new impetus to the discussion) has probably been lost in transcription.[148]

---

[147] Looking ahead to the disputed interpretation of 802, it must be remarked that here Euripides allows the god to tell a downright lie.

[148] I have serious doubts on whether the last four words are genuine. (i) They sound like a concession to Pentheus, cf. Dodds: 'Wise, rather, in this case, though their customs are different'. Cf. Winnington-Ingram, p. 112 n. 1. But Dionysus' objective is precisely that his rites should be celebrated everywhere, world wide (13-22); here no indulgence can be tolerated. Cadmus realizes this, and warns Pentheus, 331: οἴκει μεθ' ἡμῶν, μὴ θύραζε τῶν νόμων. The chorus declares Dionysus worship to be τὰ νομισθέντα ... αἰεί (71) and insist that Pentheus is an ἄνομος: 387, 893-96, 995 = 1015, 997.—Barbara K. Gold, ΕΥΚΟΣΜΙΑ *in Euripides' Bacchae* AJPh 98 (1977) 14, in my opinion is confused in her reasoning when she writes: 'this awareness of the relativity of νόμοι is also a clear statement by Dionysus that, although νόμοι might seem to be different and even evil to an outsider such as Pentheus, they still have their own validity. Thus, his νόμος, the universal law, is repugnant to Pentheus and the other uninitiates, but its validity is proven in the end'. Why should Dionysus argue the validity of different νόμοι, when his own νόμος is universal? (ii) In 485 Pentheus introduces a new word for the rites: τὰ ἱερά. Up till now there has been mention only of αἱ τελεταί, τὰ ὄργια or τὰ βακχεύματα. This is strange: is Pentheus, of his own accord, suddenly going to call the rites *holy*?

In his next question, 485: τὰ δ' ἱερὰ νύκτωρ ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν τελεῖς; 'Do you practice the holy rites at night or by day?' Pentheus tries a second time (after 471, 473) to get details of the rites which the Lydian is practising on Cithaeron with the Theban women. Again, he makes his prejudice clear, and he is paid back by the stranger in his own coin, 486: νύκτωρ τὰ πολλά· σεμνότητ' ἔχει σκότος, 'Mostly at night: darkness holds greatness'. To Pentheus' ears, this is almost an overt admission that the Theban women are providing the Lydian with sexual enjoyment.[149] Pentheus is rightly indignant about this crudeness, 487: τοῦτ' ἐς γυναῖκας δόλιόν ἐστι καὶ σαθρόν, 'that is deceitful for the women and flawed for them'.[150] The stranger's answer is reminiscent of Teiresias' sophistry (314-18), 488: κἀν ἡμέρᾳ τό γ' αἰσχρὸν ἐξεύροι τις ἄν (even in daylight you could reveal disgrace). The meaninglessness of this phrase makes the king threaten: δίκην σε δοῦναι δεῖ σοφισμάτων κακῶν (you must be punished for your nasty sophistries), but the stranger reacts challengingly to these reproaches, in his turn threatening Pentheus with punishment. So the hearing comes to a dead end: ὡς θρασὺς ὁ βάκχος κοὐκ ἀγύμναστος λόγων (how bold this bacchant is, and experienced in argument).[151] Pentheus has obtained from

For this reason I assume that in 484 Dionysus said something else, i.e.: τάδ' εὖ γε μᾶλλον· τὰ δ' ἱέρ' οὐχὶ διάφορα, 'for the holy rites make no difference', cf. 206-09. Pentheus picks up τὰ ἱερά for his next question: τὰ δ' ἱερὰ νύκτωρ ἢ μεθ' ἡμέραν τελεῖς; cf. 470-71: Δι. ... καὶ δίδωσιν ὄργια. / Πε. τὰ δ' ὄργι' ἐστί ...; The corruption must be sought in a reader's comment *in margine*: οἱ νόμοι δὲ διάφοροι, or, as the text of P reads: οἱ νόμοι διάφοροι. These words would have found their way into the text, and displaced the original wording. τὰ δ' ἱέρ' οὐχὶ διάφορα is no exception to the *lex de solutione initiali* (Th. Zielinski, *Tragodoumenon* II, 148), cf. 844 τό γ' ἐμόν, *IA* 641 τὸ δ' ἴσον (nisi τόδ' ἴσον), *Or.* 390 τὸ δ' ὄνομ', even *Tro.* 690 ὁ δ' ἐπί, 1017 σὲ δ' ἐπί. *Bacchae* 272 offers an exact parallel to this type of two resolutions in the trimeter: οὗτος δ' ὁ δαίμων, ὁ νέος, ὃν σὺ διαγελᾷς.

[149] Dodds, ad 487-89, gives parallels for connecting night with illicit love-making. Outside a religious context the word σεμνός indicates a social group, cf. Ussher on Ar. *Eccl.* 617, where αἱ σεμναί ('the great ladies', LSJ s.v. II.1) are contrasted with αἱ φαυλότεραι and σιμότεραι. In a note on the word in Ar.*Nu.* 48, K. J. Dover comments: 'applied to a woman the meaning is almost "classy", and implies one kind of sex-appeal'. He compares Xen.*Mem.* 1.2.24: Ἀλκιβιάδης δ' αὖ διὰ μὲν κάλλος ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ σεμνῶν γυναικῶν θηρώμενος, ... ἠμέλησεν αὐτοῦ. Here is this Lydian vagabond talking to the king, whose own mother has gone to Cithaeron, together with the other well-born women of Thebes: his σεμνότητ' ἔχει σκότος may be a deliberate insult to the king's face.

[150] σαθρόν 'broken', 'cracked'. See Burnet ad Pl. *Euthphr.* 5 c 1.

[151] The reproaches which are made on both sides in the hearing, can be categorized as follows:

by Pentheus to Dionysus:		by Dionysus to Pentheus:	
κίβδηλος	475		
παροχετεύων	479	ἀσεβής	476, 490, (502)
		(cf. ἀδικῶν 518)	
σαθρός	487		
δόλιος	487		
σοφιστὴς κακός	489, 491	ἀμαθής	480, 490
θρασύς	491	(cf. οὐ σώφρων 504)	
(cf. καταφρονεῖ 503)			

the stranger no information about the rites that might have relaxed his suspicions; on the contrary, the god seems to have been bent on confirming the king in his opinions. The god has certainly accused the king of being ἀμαθής (ignorant) and ἀσεβής (impious), but since Pentheus believes that he knows for certain that there is no Διόνυσος ὁ τοῦ Διός (Dionysus, son of Zeus) these accusations merely prove to the king that the Lydian is insolent. The king can only see his religious mission as a trick to seduce women; Pentheus' reasoning from common sense is not affected, rather strengthened. The fact that the Lydian seems to be οὐκ ἀγύμναστος λόγων (a practiced arguer) entirely fits the picture that he had previously had of him from his informants; cf. 233 γόης ἐπῳδός (a wizard, an enchanter), 242-43, the statements that were already current in Thebes as Κάδμου σοφίσματα (Cadmus' sophistries), and 247 ὕβρεις ὑβρίζειν, 'wanton blasphemy'.

The intitiative passes to the stranger with 492—it is he who puts the next question; it sounds self-assured with its direct imperative and colloquial idiom: εἴφ' ὅ τι παθεῖν δεῖ· τί με τὸ δεινὸν ἐργάσῃ; (Tell me my punishment—what terrible thing will you do to me?).[152] In three lines, constructed like a monologue, Pentheus details the physical measures he will take agianst the Lydian: 493 πρῶτον μὲν (first...)—495 ἔπειτα (then...)—497...τε (and next...). He does not allow himself to be put off by the stranger's objections. He will cut off his long hair, take away his thyrsus and lock him up.[153]

The king obviously gets back some of his self-confidence by establishing his authority. The stranger reacts to the prospect of imprisonment with 498 λύσει μ' ὁ δαίμων αὐτός, ὅταν ἐγὼ θέλω (The god himself will release me, whenever I want). Pentheus comments mockingly: ὅταν γε καλέσῃς αὐτὸν ἐν βάκχαις σταθείς (yes, he will, when you call on

[152] Stevens p. 41; not in Smereka. Cf. Ar. *Lys.* 366: τί δ' ἢν σποδῶ τοῖς κονδύλοις; τί μ' ἐργάσει τὸ δεινόν; Wilamowitz, ad loc., makes a charming remark about the *Bacchae*: 'ein schöner Beleg, wie sich auch in jene archaisch-stilisierte Tragödie Vulgarismen mischen'.

[153] Dodds considers, rightly I think, that it is unacceptable that the threats were carried out there and then, unlike Murray, who gives them as stage directions (also Anna Spitzbarth, *Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechischen Tragödie* (Zürich 1946) 67 includes them without commentary under the heading: Das Entkleiden oder Wegnehmen gewisser Attribute). But the business is really beyond our reach. I would suggest to a producer that he might intensify the audience's tension by letting Pentheus lightly touch the stranger's hair, since the tender ἁβρὸν βόστρυχον is remarkable on Pentheus' lips. The word ἁβρός is too loaded to be used only in a sarcastic sense, cf. Anacreon 347.1 PMG (P.Ox. 2322): καὶ κόμης, ἥ τοι κατ' ἁβρὸν ἐσκίαζεν αὐχένα, and the generally favourable connotation of ἁβρός and its adverb ἁβρῶς in poetry. See also: Max Treu, *Von Homer zur Lyrik* (München 1968) p. vf., 175ff. about 'die haptischen Empfindungswörter'. Sandys, in his commentary on 234-36, quotes Callistratus *Statuarum Descriptiones* 8 about Praxiteles' Dionysus: ἦν δὲ ἀνθηρός, ἁβρότητος γέμων, ἱμέρῳ ῥεόμενος, οἷον αὐτὸν Εὐριπίδης ἐν Βάκχαις εἰδοποιήσας ἐξέφηνε.

him standing (i.e. in the attitude of prayer) among the bacchants (i.e. in prison)'.[154] The stranger hits back hard: playing in his answer on the hidden presence of the god nearby, he makes Pentheus beside himself with rage, so that he shouts (cf. 451): λάζυσθε (seize him, 503).[155] By this

---

[154] (i) γε is not limitative, but emphatic, cf. Denn. GP 137, (viii) b. Pentheus gives a malicious twist to the stranger's thought. Bruhn explains γε as limititative: '"Freilich, wenn Du unter die Bakchen trittst und ihn anrufst"; das aber wird nimmer geschehen; denn Du bist jetzt in meinen Händen'. Schwinge (p. 363) follows Bruhn, cf. his paraphrase of the line: 'Das gilt natürlich nur, wenn du als Priester unter den Bakchen agierst, im Augenblick also auf keinen Fall'. But the emphatic meaning of γε follows on from the previous line, in which the audience would have been expressly entertained by the identity of the god and of the stranger: ὁ δαίμων αὐτός—ἐγώ. This emphasis would lose its sense if Pentheus, who is not aware of this identity, and for whom the god himself does not exist at all, were to visualize a scenario—to him unthinkable—in which the stranger should again be at liberty on the mountain. Naturally he imagines that the Lydian is chained fast in the fetters of his imprisonment. (ii) But, it can be argued, ἐν βάκχαις is completely inconsistent with the soldier's news, 443-48. This is so, and probably Euripides wanted the audience to notice just that. Pentheus wins back some of his self-confidence, now that he can let his authority be felt. Because the stranger has been arrested, picking up the women will be no trouble. (iii) Pentheus imagines that the Lydian is chained among the bacchae. Why? Because this thought must give Pentheus great pleasure. Was it not the Lydian ὅς ἡμέρας τε κεὐφρόνας συγγίγνεται ... νεάνισιν (237-38)? He can have his gathering, but only on Pentheus' conditions: chained up in fetters in prison, too strictly limited in his freedom of movement to celebrate the rites to his liking.

[155] The dialogue between Pentheus and the stranger takes place within a dramatic action that will result in the liberation of the stranger and his thiasos by the god Dionysus. Although the plot of the *Bacchae* as a whole will be directed at Dionysus' punishment of Thebes, this phase of the plot is directed towards a story nucleus which is the opposite of punishment, that of liberation (see below p. 64). At the level of audience participation the action has its light-hearted moments, when the audience can foresee a happy ending to this phase of the plot. Such a light-hearted moment is perhaps 500-03, e.g.:

500 Δι. καὶ νῦν ἃ πάσχω πλησίον παρὼν ὁρᾷ.
(the audience laugh)
501 Πε. καὶ ποῦ 'στιν;
(he is dumbfounded; a strongly emotional καί before the interrogative, cf. Denn. GP 309f.)
οὐ γὰρ φανερός ὄμμασίν γ' ἐμοῖς.
502 Δι. παρ' ἐμοί·
(hearty laughter among the audience)
σὺ δ' ἀσεβὴς αὐτὸς ὢν οὐκ εἰσορᾷς.
503 Πε. (has lost his grip on the situation)
λάζυσθε·
(he looks for a way of saving his face in front of his soldiers, now that his self-confidence has disappeared, cf. 451-52)
καταφρονεῖ με καὶ Θήβας ὅδε.

Note the psychologically pleasing addition: καὶ Θήβας. In 476-77 the king took no notice of the stranger's accusation of ἀσέβεια, naturally not, because for Pentheus the difference between piety and the Lydian's rites is as great as between heaven and earth. Even now he is not moved by the Lydian's accusations, but by his tormentor's flouting of his authority. Lines 491 and 503 are the only two in the stichomythia where Pentheus goes from the second to the third person singular. They are the two *cruces* of the respective *dramatic segments* (for these terms see note 139).

point, Euripides has quickly brought the scene to a climax. From here on the conversation takes a grimmer turn when the stranger answers Pentheus' obstinacy: ἐγὼ δὲ δεῖν γε (and I say you'll be bound, 505), and the reason for his obstinacy: κυριώτερος σέθεν (you are in my power), with a grave οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῇς (you don't know what your life is), quid sit tua vita (Murray).[156] In the next two lines Pentheus' ignorance of the fact that the god, Dionysus, exists and is standing before him is again placed in an ominous light: Pentheus proudly declares who he is (507)—the words sound like the arrogant φάσθαι 'Οδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον ἐξαλαῶσαι,/ υἱὸν Λαέρτεω, 'Ιθάκῃ ἔνι οἰκί' ἔχοντα (tell them that Odysseus, sacker of cities, blinded you, Laertes' son, who lives in Ithaca),[157] but the stranger answers, sizing up his victim with approval: ἐνδυστυχῆσαι τοὔνομ' ἐπιτήδειος εἶ (well named for misfortune—you are entirely suitable).[158]

The king brings the conversation to an end. He gives orders for the imprisonment of the stranger, and sets out measures to be taken against the women he brought with him from Lydia. The stranger has the last word. He denounces the king as ὑβριστής (blasphemer), a reproach that is continually and mutually repeated in the *Bacchae.*[159] The last line spoken by

[156] I do not believe that Dodds' and Campbell's emendation: οὐκ οἶσθ' <ἔθ'> ὅ τι φῄς, is right. As a comment it says too little: Pentheus knows quite well what he is saying (and the god knows it); he only does not know whom he is saying it to. Verdenius raises an objection on palaeographic grounds. The rest of the sentence: οὔθ' ὃ δρᾷς οὔθ' ὅστις εἶ obviously corresponds to the two phrases in 505: ἐγὼ δὲ δεῖν γε and κυριώτερος σέθεν respectively. If an emendation is necessary, I think that Schoene's οὐκ οἶσθ' ὃ τείσεις (Dodds' earlier choice) is palmary. It is convincing palaeographically (see Dodds), excellent qua meaning. Dodds translates this text: 'you do not know the penalty or the offence or even the agent'. But we must accept the reading of the papyrus, which gives a double οὔθ' ... οὔθ' ..., and read the second half line as an explanation of the first ὅ: 'you do not know what you must pay for: the things that you do, or who in fact you are'. For τίνειν + accusative, in the sense: 'pay for' (LSJ s.v. I.c), cf. *Ion* 447 ναοὺς τίνοντες ἀδικίας κενώσετε, *Or.* 109 καὶ μὴν τίνοι γ' ἂν τῇ τεθνηκυίᾳ τροφάς, and *IA* 1382: τὸν 'Ελένης τείσαντας ὄλεθρον. The moment at which payment must be made will come in 850: Δι. τεισώμεθ' αὐτόν. Pentheus, to whom as a king the idea of repayment is absurd, does not understand the words, and shows this in his answer, but it is the threats of the god which the audience hear at this point. In an abrupt switch Euripides turns from the appearance (505) to the reality of power (506).—However, I am not completely convinced that οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅ τι ζῇς is impossible. Kirk keeps to LP's reading, and cf. E. K. Borthwick, CR 16 (1966) 137.

[157] *Od.* 9.504-05. Arist.*Rhet.* 1380 b 23 quotes Homer: διὸ ὀρθῶς πεποίηται 'φάσθαι 'Οδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον', ὡς οὐ τετιμωρημένος εἰ μὴ ᾔσθετο καὶ ὑφ' ὅτου καὶ ἀνθ' ὅτου. Cf. *IT* 502.

[158] Cf. 367-69. 'The priest's warning is now reinforced by the god's—a deliberate cumulative effect' (Dodds). But the god's words are really no longer a warning, but the (contented) inspection of the sacrificial victim offered to him, since ἐπιτήδειος here means 'serviceable' (for a specific purpose), as on the other occasion when Euripides uses the word, *Andr.* 206. Cf. Thuc. 8.70: καὶ ἄνδρας τέ τινας ἀπέκτειναν οὐ πολλούς, οἳ ἐδόκουν ἐπιτήδειοι εἶναι ὑπεξαιρεθῆναι (this elimination was obviously intended to improve relations with Sparta).

[159] Hera's ὕβρις vis-a-vis Semele 9; the stranger's 247; the women's on Cithaeron 779; Pentheus' 374, 516, 555; Thebes' 1297, 1347.

the stranger before he is led away by the retainers again contains an element of playfulness through its ambiguity, 518: ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἀδικῶν κεῖνον εἰς δεσμοὺς ἄγεις. Pentheus is clearly intended to start with the central phrase in construing the sentence: 'since it is wrong to the god, that you hold me prisoner'. But the audience will construe it in the order of the words: 'since, now that you are doing me a wrong, it is the god whom you hold prisoner'.[160]

The hearing is over. The king has held the interrogation with the intention of obtaining confirmation about the offences of which the Lydian was alleged to be guilty. He has obtained this information in a roundabout way: by the fact that the beautiful Lydian does indeed seem to be the right shape ὡς ἐς γυναῖκας (to get far with women); and by his deliberately answering Pentheus' questions in a way that, outside a religious context, would confirm the assumption that the rites celebrated by the women involved drunkenness and sexual misconduct. The answers which he gets are unequivocal to Pentheus, since for him there is no religious context: there is no god Dionysus.[161] The descriptive aspect of meaning of the action shows clearly that Pentheus in no ways relates to Dionysus, but that the only relationship is between Pentheus and the stranger. When the stranger refers to Dionysus in his words, or when he acts as Dionysus (e.g. the women running loose on Cithaeron) Pentheus is deaf and blind. Pentheus neither approaches the god, nor turns away from him; he simply ignores him.[162] This is the key to understanding the action of the play, and particularly that of the next, central, episode; it is perhaps deliberate when Euripides presses this key emphatically into the hands of the audience, when the god, just before his exit, says (517): μέτεισι Διόνυσός σ', ὃν οὐκ εἶναι λέγεις (Dionysus will have his vengeance on you, he whom you say does not exist).

As far as Pentheus' character is concerned, this picture given by the descriptive aspect of meaning is not enough at this point for us to establish a firm outline of the structure of his personality. The behaviour of the king, (as one would expect with an imaginary character on the stage), is to a considerable extent determined by the development of the

---

[160] For the sake of the double meaning, and for the sake of the theatrical image (Pentheus is still master of his own palace) I would prefer to let the prisoner go in first with the soldiers, and the king to follow. So too Schwinge, p. 366f. Others think differently.

[161] Pentheus naturally lets it be seen that this lack of equivocation does not mean to him that the Lydian's answers are also clear, see 475, 479, 489, 491, 501.

[162] Otherwise: Schwinge, passim. Cf., e.g., p. 369f.: 'Damit aber, dass der König, vom Gott noch immer dazu gereizt, die das Dionysische bejahende Seite seines Wesens intensiv zu Wort kommen lässt, gerät er in Gegensatz zur früher sich allein äussernden Haltung der Ablehnung. Und da diese sich daneben gleichfalls immer wieder Geltung verschafft, schwankt er zwischen beiden hin und her'.

plot, and by the poet's intention for the creation of dramatic action. So it is possible to claim (again) in the second episode that Pentheus' character seems tyrannical (511-14) and suspicious (454, 459, 487), but to argue against this that like a good king he honestly attempts to judge rightly, by the extended hearing that he gives his prisoner. Besides: although the Thebans have been robbed of their women, and the city is facing a situation of crisis, (cf. 216), Pentheus shows mildness in thinking up a punishment that fits the Lydian's knavish tricks (493, 495, 497, 499).[163]

In the second episode the development of the plot provides a spectacle of misinterpretation and of lack of understanding deliberately caused. Because the poet has enabled the audience to see through the stranger's double role, and because only they can judge how adroitly the god hides his divinity and confirms his adversary in the Theban delusion about his mission, we must assume that the poet's intention was to provide pleasure for the audience in detecting this adroitness, and identifying it anew in each statement by the stranger. In this way the audience are led to two key points: first Pentheus' recognition in 491 that the stranger is his master in debate, and second his recognition in 503 that the stranger has challenged and punctured the king's self-assured superior authority. Moreover the end of the episode is marked by sinister overtones, by the threat, plain to the audience, of divine revenge.

The expectations aroused in the audience had also been directed (cf. p. 51) towards two questions, first, how will the god bring home to Pentheus that he really exists, and second, how will the Lydian manage to free himself from imprisonment and worse? The audience expect an answer to the second question from a play with the *story nucleus* of escape/liberation; they expect an answer to the first, in the light of the threatening words spoken by the stranger (cf. 508), from a play of divine punishment. The poet is therefore developing these two mutually opposing story nuclei (one positive and one negative) in the plot of his play. The audience's expectation of the positive story nucleus is fed by the dexterity with which the god, as the Lydian stranger, misleads his adversary; that of the negative one by the misfortune with which the stranger, as the god Dionysus, threatens Pentheus and Thebes.[164]

[163] I do not mean to say that Pentheus was given a mild character by the poet, since that would be to commit the—only too common—fault of describing Pentheus' character in isolation from the action. Euripides needs Dionysus to be bound for later events (616ff.). We must also not make suppositions about what Pentheus proposes to do with the Lydian in the future, when the women have been brought back from Cithaeron, and when peace has been restored to the city. But at the point in the action of line 493ff., the steps taken by the king (after the beheading of 241, hanging of 246, and stoning of 356) give an impression of mildness.

[164] Not only Pentheus; compare the first strophe of the chorus which immediately follows this scene.

The third episode: the palace miracles (576-656)

The palace miracles come next in the action of the play. The audience experience this episode twice: first during the amoibaion between the chorus standing in front of the palace and the god who is invisible, either behind or inside the theatre building (576-603); next during the account which the stranger gives of the events which have taken place inside the palace (616-41). The king re-enters in 642. Pentheus' actions during and after the palace miracles can be reconstructed as follows:

618 He clearly went off with the soldiers who were taking the stranger to the stables, and personally supervised the detention of the prisoner (οὗ καθεῖρξ' ἡμᾶς ἄγων).

618-21 He tied up a bull which he took to be the stranger.

624 When he felt the earth tremor he ran out of the stables (he could not see anything indoors, cf. 510 ὡς ἂν σκότιον εἰσορᾷ κνέφας) and saw the fire.

624-27 He thought that the palace had caught fire, and gave orders to put it out. But the palace was not on fire, and the work of extinguishing it was stopped (624 δώματ' αἴθεσθαι δοκῶν—627 διαμεθεὶς δὲ τόνδε μόχθον).
Returning to the stables (?) he found that the stranger had escaped (627 ὡς ἐμοῦ πεφευγότος).[165]

628 He drew his sword, and ran back into the palace (that is to say, the private apartments (?), δόμων ἔσω) to look for him.

629-31 In an inner courtyard (it is not clear whether this was a court between the stables and the private apartments, or within the private apartments themselves) he encounters another miracle: he has a vision of the stranger, made of αἰθήρ (ether). He stabs (ἐκέντει) through the stranger with his sword, without visible result.

632-33 Another earth tremor: the whole palace falls in rubble.

633-34 Pentheus breaks off his fight with the φάσμα (phantasm).

638-39 He comes outside again.

What will Pentheus say, after everything that has happened to him? As the audience hear him approach (638) this question is made specific for them by the stranger, who expresses what they are waiting for, 639 τί ποτ' ἄρ' ἐκ τούτων ἐρεῖ;[166] (whatever will he say after all this?).

---

[165] ὡς ἐμοῦ πεφευγότος belongs naturally with ἵεται, not with διαμεθείς, since Pentheus calls off the fire-fighting because the fire seems to be an illusion, and not because the stranger has disappeared. The publishers have therefore wrongly printed a comma at the end of 627.

[166] ἐκ τούτων 'after this' (Verrall, Dodds), 'after all this' (Paley, Kirk), 'now that these things have come to pass' (D. W. Lucas) is causal, not temporal. Cf. KG I 460 'infolge

Pentheus enters from the palace and cries: πέπονθα δεινά· (I have been outraged), explaining with a very emotional asyndeton: διαπέφευγέ μ' ὁ ξένος / ὃς ἄρτι δεσμοῖς ἦν κατηναγκασμένος (the stranger has escaped me, who just was constrained in chains).[167] Only then does he see the stranger standing there: ἔα ἔα (Aah). Pentheus says nothing about the fire, nothing about the two earth tremors, nothing about his halucinatory experience with the stranger's φάσμα (phantasm). Verrall has expressed it caustically (p. 67 f.): 'we are still expecting, and are expressly told to expect, the most important part of it, the effect of it all upon the King. And this effect, the full effect of all that has really happened, we see: the escape of his prisoner is the whole subject of his discourse. Only the alleged circumstances of it, such trifling accompaniments as a fire and an earthquake, are unnoticed, forgotten, ignored'.

The effect of the palace miracles on Pentheus is one of the greatest problems in the *Bacchae*; a problem which is closely linked with (but not the same as) the question of whether the chorus is the vicitim of mass-suggestion on which much has been written since Norwood and Verrall.[168] Among recent critics Dodds rejects the thought of mass-suggestion, while Winnington-Ingram (p. 180-85) is inclined to accept it. Our consideration, however, is for what they have to say about Pentheus' reactions to the events in the palace.

Dodds writes, p. 148: 'There is, however, one way, and one way only, to show a thing not-happening on the stage—you must introduce a character to point out that it has not happened. This could easily have been done. Pentheus was at hand to do it. But Pentheus denies nothing. And in the absense of such a denial the audience is bound to accept what it is told: cf. *PV.* 1080 ff., *Her.* 904 ff., *Tro.* 1295 ff., *Hec.* 823, in all of

---

dessen' contra ἐκ τούτου (KG I 459) 'hierauf', LSJ s.v. II, which, however, includes it under TIME. In Euripides ἐκ τούτων is only found here, in *Med.* 1103 and in *Tel.Fr.* 148.19 (if Pap. Ryl. III.482 belongs to this play). Perhaps Euripides found the phrase too prosaic.

[167] The asyndeton, from the nature of the remark, is not adversative. For the emotional character of such an asyndeton see KG II 340 (*sub* 3), Denn, GP xlv.

[168] Norwood and Verrall offered a radical solution for the problems of the palace miracles, in which Dionysus the god did not really have any part in the play, see p. 8. The error of this solution has already been demonstrated by many commentators, cf. Dodds, *Introd.* xlviiiff., Winnington-Ingram 7ff., 20f., 180ff. But even if Norwood and Verrall's solution has been rejected, the problems which they saw so clearly have neither disappeared nor been resolved. One can say of the palace miracles, as does Winnington-Ingram, p. 20f.: 'this episode is vague in detail, rich in symbolism, and on a plane of reality which is not quite that of the main action of the drama. In it the role of Dionysus is that of wonder-worker'. We then have a possible explanation of *how* the poet (on the conceptual level) meant the scene. But for the play to be consistent, one must explain how the level of reality of the palace miracles stands in relation to the level of reality of the rest of the action.

which the chorus or an actor describes what is happening, and the audience imagine it happening, with or without a little help from the stage manager'.

This is not the place to discuss whether the earthquake and the lightning strike which the chorus have seen (591, 596) are the result of mass-suggestion on their part. But in 642 we can only understand πέπονθα δεινά· διαπέφευγέ μ' ὁ ξένος (I have been outraged, the stranger has escaped me) as a direct denial, if not of the earthquake and the lightning strike, at least of the events related by the stranger in 629-31. Because if no miracle has appeared to Pentheus, it would not be possible for him to say: 'There has not been a miracle' (cf. G. Norwood (1954) p. 56). He can only let this be known by the words that he actually speaks—and this is just what he does. Pentheus is looking for the escaped prisoner, he is not exhausted (634-35), because he thought that he was cutting into the stranger until he realized that he was only slicing through the air. The meaning of 642-56 cannot therefore be, as Dodds writes (p. 157): 'to show the dawning of a new relationship between the antagonists, brought about by the strange happenings behind the scenes'. Pentheus simply does not understand *how* the stranger could get out of the palace (645-46, 648)[169]: he again accuses the stranger of being a clever talker (650, 655) not of being a miracle worker, and he takes measures just the same (653), as in the scene in the second episode, with the object of keeping the Lydian away from the women on Cithaeron.[170]

On the other hand Winnington-Ingram allows for the possibility that Euripides wrote the palace miracle scene with the intention of giving a suggestion of subjectivity (which, for the chorus, would involve a phenomenon of mass hallucination). He then goes on (p. 185): 'Not only would this add a brilliant and convincing feature to the total picture of Dionysiac psychology, but such a reaction on the part of the Chorus would be complementary to the illusions of Pentheus within the palace. Pentheus is a sinner and the Bacchanals "saints", but I have argued elsewhere that he is in fact portrayed with Dionysiac characteristics and that his similarity to his opponents is part of the pattern of the play. It would, therefore, be appropriate for both him and them to display the

---

[169] It is only about this question, and not about any other, that Pentheus is worried. Dodds comments on πρὸς οἴκοις τοῖς ἐμοῖς (646): 'an escaped prisoner strolling outside his prison adds insult to injury'. This obscures the meaning of the scene. Pentheus is humiliated, but only the stranger has told us this, 616: ταῦτα καὶ καθύβρισ' αὐτόν. We hear nothing about whether Pentheus too feels it to be a humiliation. His words πέπονθα δεινά refer, it appears from the asyndeton, to the following sentence, cf. n. 167.

[170] Compare too 675-76, 792-93, in which there is certainly no trace of any new relationship between Pentheus and the stranger.

same kind of reaction at the same juncture to the same manifestation of the god'.

But how does Pentheus display the same kind of reaction as the chorus to the same manifestation of the god? Winnington-Ingram, p. 86: 'The Pentheus who emerges from the palace is quieter, more normal, essentially unchanged from the Pentheus who committed Dionysus to prison. "What will he say after this", asks the god, and the answer is that he will say nothing of anything except the escape of his prisoner. A sign undoubtedly of the hold that the prisoner has upon his imagination and emotions; but a sign also of the plane upon which the immediately preceding events have taken place'.

Winnington-Ingram therefore replaces the *denial* of any experience of divinity on Pentheus' part with an unconscious *acceptance* of such an experience. But such refined psychology can not be reconciled with the way in which meanings occur in a play; Diller rightly rejected the validity of such a method of interpretation.[171] Surely, if Euripides had wanted to give this presentation of Pentheus' state of mind at this point of the action, he would have made it clear to his audience on the descriptive level of meaning, whatever form he had given to the transfer of this meaning; but he could not make such a state of mind clear by silence. Even less does he give his public a psychological riddle, not to be solved for hundreds of lines, or indeed until the action of the play has been completed. The question therefore still remains, what is the meaning, in its descriptive aspect, of Pentheus' denial of experiencing anything divine.

In the first two episodes of the *Bacchae* the audience are confronted with two conflicting facts: Pentheus denies, consistently and absolutely, the existence of the god Dionysus; the audience, however, see this god actually appear.—When the third episode begins, the audience are, just as they were before, confronted with a manifestation of the god Dionysus. Whether the palace miracles of the earthquake and the fire depend on mass suggestion, or on events which really took place on the stage, is perhaps left by the poet to the spectator's personal view of a world in which a god becomes manifest: the spectator will surely attach that meaning to the palace miracles that can be reconciled with his own terms of reference.[172] But, in its descriptive aspect, the spectator accepts the earth-

---

[171] Cf. p. 11f. Winnington-Ingram (p. 73f.) compares Pentheus' silence with the manner in which he receives the soldier's news, 436-48. But here too his interpretation is not acceptable, cf. n. 128.

[172] Cf. J. C. Kamerbeek, *De Antieke Tragedie* p. 110 n. 1, who rejects Verrall's rationalist approach to the play, but then comments: 'Naturally I do not mean to say that Euripides went so far as to actually *believe* in any of these miracles in the everyday sense of the word.'

quake and the fire as acts of the god, in the reality of the theatre, just as he accepts the madness of the Theban women (32-38) as an act of the god, and as he will continue to accept many more events in the action as acts of the god.

But in the action of the third episode too the spectator is faced with a Pentheus who still, consistently and absolutely, denies the existence of the god Dionysus. These facts cannot be denied, and perhaps they were without more ado accepted by many in the audience with the same ease with which they had accepted the contradiction in the previous scenes: Pentheus is not approachable by the god, whether he manifests himself to him directly or indirectly, he is a theomachos with all its consequences (cf. note 127 sub (ii)). Naturally this does not mean that other spectators, let alone Euripides himself, had no explanation for the fact that Pentheus, in 642 ff. as well, does not seem to be approachable by the divine manifestation. The explanation can only be sought in the strangers' account (604-41) since it is quite logical for Pentheus to say nothing about things outside the palace, in which the audience have themselves taken part, that is the earthquake (585 ff.) and the flame which shot up from Semele's grave (594 ff.). But Pentheus says nothing at all about the events which, according to the stranger, have happened inside the palace, and at which Pentheus was present. We have therefore the choice of two possibilities, and perhaps Euripides deliberately left this choice to his audience: either everything which the stranger told the chorus about the events in the palace truly happened, only the god took care that what happened did not get through to Pentheus, or, in his satirical account of the events in the palace the stranger is deliberately telling a tissue of lies, to heighten the joy of his escape, and to paint in strong colours the downfall of his hated oppressor. The real events were in fact only the earth tremors (623) and the flame which shot up from Semele's grave (623-24).

It seems most probable that a mixture of both answers was sufficient explanation for the audience of the fact that Pentheus had taken no part in any events which he recognized as miracles; Dionysus is still no god for him.[173] But whichever explanation the spectator may choose for the

[173] To illustrate the point: if I had then been a spectator, I would have accepted the tying up of the bull in accordance with possibility (i) albeit with some scepticism about the king's fury (620-21); I would also have accepted the φάσμα, but from 630 ὁ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦθ' ὡρμημένος to 635 παρεῖται I would have judged the stranger's story as being a comic exaggeration in accordance with possibility (ii). Note the sarcastic λυμαίνεται 632 and πικροτάτους ἰδόντι δεσμοὺς τοὺς ἐμούς 634 as an answer to Pentheus λυμαίνεται 354 and πικρὰν βάκχευσιν ἐν Θήβαις ἰδών 357. The double qualification made by the god in 629: ὡς ἔμοιγε φαίνεται, δόξαν λέγω, can be accepted as a warning to the audience that from this point on truth and fiction are no more to be distinguished from each other.

various parts of the stranger's account in 604-41, this explanation takes him back to the previous episode, in which the stranger and Pentheus repeatedly threw accusations at each other (see note 151). The audience can establish that these accusations appear justified to both antagonists: Pentheus is ἀσεβής (impious) and ἀμαθής (ignorant), the stranger/ Dionysus is κίβδηλος, σαθρός, δόλιος, θρασὺς κοὐκ ἀγύμναστος λόγων (fraudulent, bent, cunning, bold and experienced in argument), whether in the way in which he cunningly takes care that Pentheus does not realize what is really happening to him, or in the way in which he dished up exaggerations and untruths to the chorus. The Dionysus of the *Bacchae* is no whit better than the Apollo of the *Andromache* or of the *Ion*.

When Pentheus sees the stranger standing in front of the palace (644) he groans: ἔα ἔα. Dodds has rightly called the short dialogue that follows between them a 'transition dialogue'; but at the same time this short scene is necessary to the plot: it is the connection between the two phases of the plot which have different story nuclei: rescue/liberation and revenge. First, this scene ends the phase of the plot in which the Lydian and his thiasos (the chorus) have escaped from the king's stranglehold. The audience's expectant waiting to see how the god would free himself is spectacularly satisfied. Naturally the audience knew that a god cannot really be in danger. Therefore the spectacle of the earthquake and the lightning strike, and the comedy made by the stranger of his account of the events which took place inside the walls of the palace, are marked by a certain lightness. The story is rounded off by the appearance of Pentheus, who was clearly in no position to hold the stranger prisoner.

Secondly this scene is the introduction to the first great messenger speech. In this scene the audience's attention is directed towards the Theban women on Cithaeron. The things which the messenger has to tell about them are terrible (see chapter 5); his news will be the real beginning of the drama in which the god executes his vengeance. But that still lies before us; this moment, in the scene between Pentheus and the stranger, the positions of the two antagonists are spelled out in a sequence which can be compared in its smallest detail with that of 498-506, and from which it appears that these positions remain unchanged in spite of the palace miracles.

The answer to the king's impatient question on how the stranger managed to leave the palace is οὐκ εἶπον—ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσας—ὅτι λύσει μέ τις; (didn't I say?—or didn't you hear?—that someone would release me). This answer is reminiscent of 498, but it includes the sharp irony of the indefinite τις (someone) in contrast to 'the god himself' of 498. Pentheus does not understand the answer (650 τίς; τοὺς λόγους γὰρ ἐσφέρεις καινοὺς ἀεί) (Who? You are always bringing in new arguments), but now the

stranger refers to the god who gave wine to men, and the king understands; he makes a coarse remark (which is lost in the text) about the stranger's real intention. For the lacuna in the text one can imagine Pentheus asking sarcastically whether the alleged god uses wine to ruin his women;[174] such a remark would correspond to Pentheus' sarcasm in 499: ὅταν γε καλέσῃς αὐτὸν ἐν βάκχαις σταθείς (when you call on him standing among the bacchants). But the stranger returns the ball, just as he did in 500 and 502, by referring to the god's identity with himself: ὠνείδισας δὴ τοῦτο Διονύσῳ καλόν (you reproach Dionysus for his glory). This reference is a closed book for Pentheus, but not for the audience.[175] Pentheus' indignation is again aroused by the deliberate double meaning in the stranger's answer, since it suggests to him that what he has rightly blamed the stranger for is καλόν (glorious) in Dionysiac piety, while the *god* intimates that the imposition of his will on the Theban women will reveal that he really is a god, son of Zeus and Semele (39-42).[176] Just as in 503 the king at this point turns his back upon the stranger, seeking help from the agents of his authority, and calls for action: shut the gates! The order is meant to prevent the Lydian from exercising his Dionysiac piety on Cithaeron. But from the stranger the order only results in a smiling, and self-confident, statement, 654: τί δ'; οὐχ ὑπερβαίνουσι καὶ τείχη θεοί; (What now? Can't gods pass over walls?)[177] His reaction is comparable to 504. Pentheus tries again to make quite clear what is wanting in the stranger's understanding of the situation, 655: σοφὸς σοφὸς σύ, πλὴν ἃ δεῖ σ' εἶναι σοφόν (clever, clever, except in those things where it is necessary), just as he did in 505 with his reproof, i.e. οὐ γιγνώσκοντα ἐμὲ κυριώτερον εἶναι σέθεν (not recognizing that I have more power than you), but the god answers him in earnest, threatening as in 506, and he tells the king, still using the play on words with which the audience are familiar, that it is precisely the life and the actions of the king over which the god has a sovereign power (656): ἃ δεῖ μάλιστα, ταῦτ' ἔφυν σοφός. And this phrase: 'Particularly where it is necessary, that is where I am wise', in truth becomes the motto of the drama of divine vengeance which now unfolds. A messenger approaches from Cithaeron, and a new scene begins.

---

[174] One can imagine a lost line 651ª e.g.: ᾠνωμένας δ' ὀλοῦντά σέ γε λύει θεός; 'And the god released you in order that you would destroy the women in their drunkenness?' See Appendix 2.

[175] The audience would in any case assume ὠνείδισας δὴ τοῦτο Διονύσῳ as being the same as ὠνείδισας δὴ τοῦτο ἐμοί. Cf. note 156.

[176] Compare Dionysus καλλίνικος, 1147 and 1161, and the refrain from the third stasimon, 877-81 = 897-901. See p. 164ff.

[177] The line was explained by Bruhn: εἰ δ' ὑπερβαίνουσιν, ἆρ' οὐ κἀμὲ ῥᾳδίως ἂν ὁ Διόνυσος ὑπερβιβάσειεν; For Pentheus the god Dionysus does not exist; he cannot therefore have the gates shut to prevent the god from entering or leaving the town. The question with which the stranger reacts to his orders for the doors to be shut, is accepted by Pentheus as a theologian's quibble, and he indignantly says: σοφὸς σοφὸς σύ.

CHAPTER FIVE

PENTHEUS (2)—*BACCHAE* 657-1392

The third episode (*continued*) (657-861)

The herdsman, coming from Cithaeron to tell Pentheus what has been happening in the mountains, enters from the right parodos;[178] when the god sees him coming, he comments to the audience, alluding perhaps to the task he had set himself for Thebes: 'Listen to him first and learn what he has to say', τοὺς λόγους μάθε (ἐκμαθεῖν 39, cf. p. 35).[179] Obviously the god already knows what the herdsman has to tell; in 657 he is giving an instant illustration of the previous line ἃ δεῖ μάλιστα, ταῦτ' ἔγωγ' ἔφυν σοφός (particularly where it is necessary, that is where I'm wise). Euripides has here smoothly linked together the two plots of the tragedy (cf. p. 64, p. 70). But Pentheus does not realize that in 658 ὃς ἐξ ὄρους πάρεστιν ἀγγελῶν τί σοι (coming from the mountain to tell you something), the stranger is showing that his knowledge goes beyond that of a common mortal, cf. 674-76.

The ῥῆσις ἀγγελική (messenger speech) of 677-774, with that of 1043-1152, and *Ion* 1122-1228 is one of the longest speeches in Greek tragedy.[180] The herdsman describes, with a mixture of holy awe and great astonishment (664-67, see also note 181), the doings of the Theban women on Cithaeron. First he paints a broad picture of the order and tranquility which reigns among them when they sleep (686-88) and when they get up (693), after Agave has heard the cattle lowing. Then he tells of the marvellous things the women do; they girdle themselves with snakes (698), suckle fawns or wolf-cubs (699), strike water and wine from rocks and earth (704-07), and make fountains of milk spring from the ground (710), while streams of honey drip from their thyrsi (711). He finishes the account with a personal opinion 712-13: ὥστ', εἰ παρῆσθα, τὸν

[178] Not by the left-hand parodos (as in J. Roux), see p. 146-148.

[179] 'Listen to him and take his words to heart' (Winnington-Ingram, p. 87). But μανθάνειν is used regularly in a meaning which does not differ noticeably from κλύειν, ἀκούειν, e.g. *IT* 493, 494, 1172, *Ion* 1432, *Pho.* 904. D. W. Lucas translates: 'But first listen and hear what this man has to tell'.

[180] Very long messenger speeches are characteristic of Euripides' late work, cf. Brigitte Mannsperger, *Die Rhesis*, in W. Jens, ed., *Bauformen* 143ff. The author wrongly counts *Pho.* 1090-1199 among Euripides' longest speeches (p. 146-47 and note 20), when 1104-40 are an interpolation (Ed. Fraenkel, Sitzb. Bayer. Akad., München 1963, (1) 58ff. with older references). On the other hand: *Pho.* 1356-1479 is, in my view, one rhesis. The interruption by the leader of the chorus, 1425-26, does not denote any change of speaker.

θεὸν τὸν νῦν ψέγεις/εὐχαῖσιν ἂν μετῆλθες εἰσιδὼν τάδε (so that if you had been there, and seen it, you would have shared in the worship of the god you are now blaming).

The gruesome events which the herdsman tells of next (714-74) are of quite another kind. The account consists of four parts: the introduction (714-27), when the herdsmen decide to hunt the bacchae; the fury with which the woman react (728-47) by sparagmos of the cattle; following this (748-68) the snatching of the children from the villages of Hysiae and Erythrae; finally (769-74), another personal opinion to end the account: let Pentheus accept the god into the city. The climax in the description of the bacchae's frenzy is in the third part, but this episode has never, apparently, been fully understood in modern times. This lack of understanding springs from the heavy corruption of the text in 756 f. and 761, and from Nonnus' description *Dionys.* XLV 285 ff., which corresponds with Euripides' account of the kidnapping.

In their frenzy the Theban women seize children, and nothing else, from Hysiae and Erythrae. After rendering vain the defense of the inhabitants, they return to the high mountains with the stolen children. There the children fall victim to the counterpart ritual to sparagmos, that of omophagia. The herdsman only touches cursorily upon this dreadful event (767-68), just as Euripides elsewhere in his work is reserved in describing omophagia, as opposed to his treatment of sparagmos (cf. Dodds, Introd. xvii). Perhaps here this reserve has a dramatic function as well: a portrayal of the children being devoured raw would, on the descriptive level, weaken too much the high point of the whole play's catastrophe, Pentheus being torn to pieces, and on the participational level it would perhaps turn the audience's emotions too much against the god. This interpretation of the kidnapping in the *Bacchae* demands a detailed discussion of the text of 748-68, but this would be too great an interruption to our examination of the action. This passage is therefore discussed in Appendix 3.

Euripides makes the herdsman refer, in the personal comment at the end of his description, to the referential aspect of Dionysus' actions on Cithaeron, by naming the two extreme qualities in which the god is manifest: his fearfulness and his loveliness. He does this in a way which is characteristic of his dramatic role.[181] The leader of the chorus continues

---

[181] With οὖν and with τά τ' ἄλλα the herdsman sums up the god's gruesome deeds, while κἀκεῖνο concentrates on his pleasant aspects. 'In content and style this is bathos', says Winnington-Ingram (p. 98), and he believes that the herdsman, after the sublime poetry of his news, now returns to his own character, and with it 'to Pentheus' own level of morality and sensibility' (p. 99). But the gift of wine is an essential attribute of the god Dionysus; it stands in a wider perspective of desire and beauty, cf. the first stasimon

the herdsman's doxology, 777: Διόνυσος ἥσσων οὐδένος θεῶν ἔφυ (No god was born greater than Dionysus).

What will Pentheus say now, faced with these facts? He states firmly that what the Theban women have done is an ὕβρισμα (wanton violence) and a great shame upon Greeks 778-79.[182] The audience cannot disagree with him in this, only they know that it is not the women's ὕβρισμα, but the god's. But Pentheus does not give way, in spite of the marvels which he must accept to be true,[183] and in spite of the advice given him by the herdsman, 769 f.: τὸν δαίμον' οὖν τόνδ' ὅστις ἔστ', ὦ δέσποτα, / δέχου πόλει τῇδε (so whoever this power is, lord, receive him into the city). The only effect of the messenger's speech on Pentheus is that the king does not keep his accusing finger pointed at the stranger, as in 675-76, but holds only the women responsible for these new and more shameful deeds: this new provocation by the women threatens the nation so seriously that from this moment the king strives for an immediate and bloody solution. There is no place for the god Dionysus in Pentheus' philosophy. As *theomachos* he remains consistently ἀσεβής (impious) and ἀμαθής (ignorant).

Did Dionysus count on this consistent denial of his divinity by Pentheus, when he unfolded his plan for Thebes in the prologue (47-54)?[184] He then said that he would provide proof for Pentheus and all the Thebans that he was a god, and would not leave for another country until he should have brought all this to a good (εὖ) end, but that he would commit the maenads to the fray if Thebes attempted to drag the bacchae back from the mountain by armed force, and that his disguise as a mortal would serve this purpose.

402-16. The herdsman puts this into words in a personal, and, particularly in 771, simple style, suited to his dramatic role; the content does not differ noticeably from the words of the god himself 859-61: γνώσεται δὲ τὸν Διὸς / Διόνυσον, ὃς πέφυκεν ἐν τέλει θεὸς / δεινότατος, ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἠπιώτατος.

[182] ἐς Ἕλληνας can be: 'a discredit in the eyes of the Greeks' (Dodds, contra Verdenius, cf. Pl.*Gorg.* 526b 2: εἷς δὲ καὶ πάνυ ἐλλόγιμος γέγονεν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας, Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου), as well as: 'to the discredit of the Greeks' since the women are in fact also Greeks. In the *Hecuba* the queen calls on the Greeks to shun what is φόγος for them, 384 f.: (εἰ δὲ δεῖ ...) φόγον φυγεῖν / ὑμᾶς, Ὀδυσσεῦ, τήνδε μὲν μὴ κτείνετε, and Agamemnon is afraid of doing anything which shall be φόγος in the eyes of the Greeks, 1247ff.: τάχ' οὖν παρ' ὑμῖν ῥᾴδιον ξενοκτονεῖν· / ἡμῖν δέ γ' αἰσχρὸν τοῖσιν Ἕλλησιν τόδε. / πῶς οὖν σε κρίνας μὴ ἀδικεῖν φύγω φόγον, / οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην.

[183] By the device of the messenger speech the spectator comes face to face with events in the play which are enacted off-stage. The level of reality cannot be tampered with. This theatrical convention alone condemns to failure Verrall's attempt to demonstrate that Euripides, by the herdsman's speech, is pointing out that 'the story is throughout a distortion of the truth, and, in the miraculous part, sheer fancy' (p. 89)

[184] Cf. Richard Hamilton, *Bacchae 47-52: Dionysus' Plan.* TAPhA 104 (1974) 139-49.

As regards his proof, the god has convinced the herdsman, and perhaps other Thebans, of his divinity. But for the king he is still a non-god; none of this has been changed by his miracles in the city and on Cithaeron. As for sending in his maenads, the god does not appear to have kept to his word. The herdsmen may indeed have provoked the women, but they did this not in anger (ὀργῇ 51) but to please the king (χάριν τ' ἄνακτι θώμεθα 721). And they did it not as armed soldiers (σὺν ὅπλοις 51), but as hunters (θηρασώμεθα 719), who immediately ran like hares before the women's thyrsi (734).[185] The god is indeed committing the maenads to the fray, although the necessary condition, which he had laid down in the prologue, has not yet been fulfilled, and he sows death and destruction in the villages and among the herdsmen's cattle. As for his disguise, the god has until now only misled Pentheus and the Thebans with it, and it has in no way furthered either part of his plan.

The execution of Dionysus' plan has met an impasse. The revelation of Dionysus' divinity has, through the agency of the god, led to bloodshed, and in spite of this has not had the desired result. Now Thebes too is preparing to shed blood (784-85). It is illuminating to compare this development with that in the *Ion.* There Hermes had set out Apollo's plan in the prologue (67-75). Apollo too lays a false trail, when he identifies Ion as the son of Xuthus (69-71) with the intention that he shall in due course be recognized as her son by Creusa (cf. 1566 ff.). But the god's deceit works too well, and his plan threatens to miscarry. The god intervenes twice 1564 ff.: θανεῖν σε δείσας μητρὸς ἐκ βουλευμάτων / καὶ τήνδε πρὸς σοῦ, μηχαναῖς ἐρρύσατο (afraid that you would die from your mother's plans and she from yours, he saved you by his devices). When we look at the course of the action in the *Bacchae,* we see something similar. Dionysus, by appearing as a beautiful Lydian youth both in the city and on Cithaeron has misled Thebes, and particularly Pentheus. This deceit too works too well; it proves to Pentheus that the Κάδμου σοφίσματα (Cadmus' sophistries) are not tenable; it proves that the god Dionysus does not exist. So Dionysus' plan to prove his divinity to Pentheus and to all the Thebans threatens to miscarry (cf. the dialogue in 498-508 and 649-56). The god resorts to a *mechanema* ('device', cf. p. 32 f.) in order to steer the course of the action in the direction he wants.[186] In the *Ion* the only victim is a single dove; in the plot of divine punishment of the *Bacchae* the consequences are terrible: destruction of cattle, violence and

---

[185] On the other hand Hamilton (p. 143) is wrong in connecting 758ff. to the prologue: (a) the villagers do not attack, but protect themselves; (b) their aim is to rescue their children, not ἐξ ὄρους βάκχας ἄγειν.

[186] It is perhaps Euripides' irony to let the gods in both cases find the occasion of furthering the train of events which they want in a *blasphemy*: *Ion* 1189, *Ba.* 717-20.

chaos in the villages, and infanticide. But the god's plan, the revelation of his divinity to Thebes, has got nowhere so far as Pentheus is concerned. It can be supposed that Dionysus had taken account of this in his plan (50-52); moreover such violence might have been expected to result in a massive flight of the men, but not in the destruction of the whole male population. But the god's aim would not be achieved by it—the god has learnt this, since he has already made the experiment of an armed clash in the assault on Hysiae and Erythrae: even then Pentheus was still not convinced of Dionysus' divinity.

In the last scene of the third episode the god is forced to produce a second *mechanema* to deliver proof of his divinity. In the *Ion* Apollo has another trick up his sleeve which he keeps in reserve: the basket in which Creusa had laid the new born child, with the embroidered clothes. He uses this basket for his second *mechanema* to prevent Ion from killing his mother. The audience were made aware of the existence of this basket, and of the costly clothing, in the prologue (26-27, 32, 37-40), but Ion knew nothing of it, 329: ἔχω γὰρ οὐδέν, ὦ γύναι, τεκμήριον (I have no proof, woman). The god has deliberately kept this τεκμήριον (proof) hidden from Ion for all these years (1343, 1353). Euripides makes the god Dionysus pursue a similar course in the *Bacchae.* In the prologue the audience is made aware that the god has driven the women of Thebes mad (32-36). But the Thebans know nothing of this, and believe that the women have left the city πλασταῖσι βακχείαισι (in fake bacchic revels) (218). In the action the god keeps the true facts hidden from the king; indeed as a stranger he confirms Pentheus' (incorrect) suspicions. He has kept hidden the trick he reserved for an emergency: of driving the king mad, so that by this he shall reveal himself as god. But the god's deceit of appearing in mortal shape seems to be stronger than the manifestations of his divinity (443-48, 576 ff., 695-711, 734-68). So, compelled by the obstinacy of the *theomachos* he must bring his second *mechanema* into action: the stranger, clearly acting as the god Dionysus, drives the king mad, just as he had driven the women of Thebes mad before the beginning of the action. The madness with which the god afflicts his adversary is the crowning wisdom of his divine intellect, cf. 656: ἃ δεῖ μάλιστα, ταῦτ' ἔγωγ' ἔφυν σοφός (particularly where it is necessary, that is where I'm wise), and 1190 (versus corruptus).[187] But at the same time the madness is, given his refusal to abandon his mortal appearance for Pentheus, the

---

[187] The points of correspondence between *Ion* and *Bacchae* suggested here differ from those listed by Hans Diller op. cit. (cf. note 55) p. 488f. Although Diller assigns a different place in the *Bacchae* to σοφία (p. 482ff.) than results from my research (see p. 107 and 159ff.). I adopt his thesis (p. 482): 'Er [Pentheus] wird den Kampf um die σοφία verlieren'.

only way left to him of proving his divinity to Pentheus and to all the Thebans; a god never suffered a greater defeat on the Athenian stage.

The god tries to postpone this defeat for as long as possible. When Pentheus gives orders to his soldiers to assemble for the attack on the bacchae, the god tries to make the impossible possible, to change Pentheus' mind about using violence without at the same time having to disclose his divine identity: πείσῃ μὲν οὐδέν, τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων κλύων, / Πενθεῦ· κακῶς δὲ πρὸς σέθεν πάσχων, ὅμως / οὔ φημι χρῆναί σ' ὅπλ' ἐπαίρεσθαι θεῷ (nothing will harm you, if you listen to my words, Pentheus; though you are harming me, I still say that you ought not to take up arms against a god) (787-89).[188] In the dialogue 787-809 between the stranger and Pentheus, he tries to convince the king in two ways.[189] First (787-801) he tries to do so by showing Pentheus that he is opposing a god (789, 790, 795). The passage is distichomythia from 792 onwards. Pentheus reacts to the stranger's warnings with anger (792-93) and sarcasm (796-97),[190] and

[188] πείσει for πείθει P was proposed by Tyrrell, but he withdrew his emendation in Hermathena 4 (1883) 297. However, I think that πείσῃ deserves the preference over πείθῃ. It hangs much more closely together with Pentheus' last line εἰ πρὸς γυναικῶν πεισόμεσθ' ἃ πάσχομεν (cf. Dodds), while his objection to it ('it really destroys the force of the μέν ... δέ antithesis', Dodds) is not fatal: the antithesis covers the whole complex πείσῃ μὲν οὐδέν, τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων κλύων, versus κακῶς δὲ πρὸς σέθεν πάσχων ὅμως οὔ φημι. The occurrence of πάσχειν in both clauses weakens the strength of the antithesis, cf. Denn. GP 370. Furthermore: (i) the herdsman has spoken, not Dionysus. But the natural meaning of πείθῃ μὲν οὐδέν, 'you are not listening at all (to the herdsman's words)' is rendered impossible by τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων κλύων (in the manuscript Dionysus' speech in this scene up to 842 is given to the herdsman). (ii) πείθῃ μὲν οὐδέν is premature at this moment, when Dionysus is making a supreme effort to make Pentheus change his mind (cf. 802, 806). (iii) If one reads πείσῃ, then τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων κλύων applies, as one would expect, to the god's last attempt at persuasion, which he is now about to begin. It is the only place in the *Bacchae* where Dionysus uses the vocative Πενθεῦ. Perhaps the copyist's memory of 309: Τε. ἀλλ' ἐμοί, Πενθεῦ, πιθοῦ, played its part in this. Palaeographically too the corruption of ΠΕΙCΕΙ to ΠΕΙΘΕΙ would be easy when the middle cross-stroke of the second E went too far to the left. *Chr.Pat.* 2277 has πείθῃ μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν ἐμῶν κλύειν λόγων, spoken by a guard at the tomb of the risen Christ to the high priests, who wave away his account of what has happened there with: σὺ πόλλ' ὕπνωσας καὶ λαλεῖς ὀνείρατα (2270). But the author of the cento could have read πείσῃ in Euripides, and taken it as the future of πείθεσθαι (he could not use the future). Cf. 2286, where the guard says to the high priests: ἐπείπερ οὐ πείθῃ σὺ τοῖς ἐμοῖς λόγοις. Tuilier also refers for this line to *Bacchae* 787, but cf. *Hipp.* 1088: δράσω τάδ', εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πείσῃ λόγοις.

[189] This division shows a correspondence with that of the stichomythia in the second episode (460-508), cf. p. 55. The first part of the dialogue is centred on the god and his rites (cf. τοῖσι θύουσιν 473, θύσω 796); this part ends in an impasse (491, 800-01). The second part is centred on the stranger; this part ends in action by Pentheus at the point where the identity of the god and the stranger is almost revealed (503, 809, cf. 653).

[190] 796 θύσω, φόνον γε θῆλυν, ὥσπερ ἄξιαι. Wilamowitz wanted to read ὥσπερ ἄξιος, *sc.* ἐστὶν ὁ Διόνυσος. Dodds agrees with this: 'the point must be that the female victims suit the womanish and woman-worshipped god'. But Pentheus holds the women responsible (778-79, 786), not the (non-existent) god; even less the stranger with his effeminate appearance, who was in any case his prisoner during the ὕβρισμα βακχῶν.

finally (800-01), just as in 491, finds himself at a dead end: the bacchant is still θρασὺς κοὐκ ἀγύμναστος λόγων (bold and experienced in argument).[191] Next the stranger tries to convince Pentheus from the point of view of the character which Pentheus believes him to be, 802: ὦ τᾶν, ἔτ' ἔστιν εὖ καταστῆσαι τάδε (Sir, these things can still be arranged).[192] Here the dialogue goes over to stichomythia. The king reacts irritably; what advice can the stranger, who has caused him so much trouble, but who is now thrust into the background by the events on Cithaeron, give him now? Must Thebes submit slavishly to the murderous cravings of its women? The stranger makes his proposition to Pentheus, 804: ἐγὼ γυναῖκας δεῦρ' ὅπλων ἄξω δίχα (I will bring the women here without using force).[193] In the circumstances he could not have made a more absurd proposal. For a great part of the action the king has been taken up with his task of keeping the stranger separated from the women on the mountain. And now, at the moment that an immediate and bloody solution seems to be the only way out of a situation which has taken such a grim turn, this same stranger comes along with the proposal to let him go to the women, and bring them back to the city! 805: οἴμοι, τόδ' ἤδη δόλιον ἔς με μηχανᾷ (Oh lord, is this the trick you are devising against me?)[194] And the god cannot refrain from continuing his masquerade with Pentheus,

---

[191] οὔτε πάσχων οὔτε δρῶν is a formal antithesis; the stranger has not yet done anything (see Dodds). Verdenius rightly gives no credence to Winnington-Ingram's psychologising, p. 102 note 1: 'the word may be an unconscious admission that the initiative is passing to the Stranger'. However, there is some point in the antithesis, since Euripides probably also uses δρῶν for the sake of tragic irony; the audience know that the stranger is the god who, having acted on Cithaeron, and soon to take action in his second *mechanema*, will not, during his actions, keep silent (810ff.).

[192] About ὦ τᾶν Stevens says, p. 42: 'Ostensibly a polite form of address, sometimes used to an equal or superior, but very often with a note of condescension or impatience,' He qualifies ὦ τᾶν here as 'ostensibly respectfully, but with an undercurrent of irony' (p. 43). It accentuates 'the sinister mockery of the dialogue' (p. 68). In my opinion ὦ τᾶν here too is an expression of what G. J. de Vries, *Mnem.* S.IV 19 (1966) 229-30 shows is its meaning in most places in which the idiom is used in tragedy (S.*OT* 1145, *Ph.* 1387, E.*Cy.* 536, *Heracl.* 688), that is to say 'condescending pity'. The god is reluctantly brought to the point where he must put his *mechanema* into operation.

[193] Dodds: 'I take this to be a genuine offer'. Stevens p. 68 n. 156: 'I cannot believe that at this point Dionysus is about to make a genuine offer and would be willing to forego his vengeance'. (i) There is, of course, a condition to the offer. In so far as the condition is fulfilled, the offer is genuine. (ii) Dionysus knows that the condition will not be fulfilled: because the stranger does not reveal his identity, Dionysus still does not exist for Pentheus. To this extent the god's words are a sinister mockery—Anne Pippin Burnett's theory (CPh 1970 23) that in 802ff. Pentheus gets an offer from the god of: 'peace, rescue, alliance, blessedness, ... the love of god' is most improbable.

[194] In my opinion the choice of words is above all an expression of pained surprise: 'this is really the height of deceitfulness'. Cf. *Andr.* 1066, where Peleus, when he hears about the attempts on Neoptolemus' life, cries out: οἴμοι, τόδ' ἤδη δεινόν. The conversational idiom which Stevens (ad loc.) suspects for this expression, is perhaps equally present in our context in the variation δόλιον.

806: ποῖόν τι, σῷσαί σ' εἰ θέλω τέχναις ἐμαῖς; (What sort of trick, if I want to save you with my wiles?). After all, he knows what Pentheus understands by the stranger's τέχναι (wiles), cf. 675: τὸν ὑποθέντα τὰς τέχνας / γυναιξὶ τόνδε (this man who offers his wiles to the women).

The stranger's words arouse Pentheus' suspicions. Did he too have a hand in the dreadful events which have taken place on Cithaeron (cf. 657-59)?[195] And were these to establish the bacchic rites safely forever? The god answers the king in a way that the audience are beginning to recognize: Pentheus, in a riddle to which only the audience know the answer, is confronted with the identity of god and stranger (cf. 500-02, 652), and, just as in 652, his suspicions are confirmed, 807-08:

Πε. ξυνέθεσθε κοινῇ τάδ', ἵνα βακχεύητ' ἀεί.
Δι. καὶ μὴν ξυνεθέμην—τοῦτό γ' ἔστι—τῷ θεῷ.

'You are united in this: to celebrate the rites forever'.
'Quite right. I am united, that is true—with the god'.[196]

---

[195] I do not know what Bruhn based his comment on ad 807: 'Er vermutet einen Mordanschlag'.

[196] Nowadays there is fairly general acceptance (one exception is A. Tovar) of Musgrave-Elmsley's emendation:

καὶ μὴν ξυνεθέμην τοῦτό γ', ἴσθι, τῷ θεῷ.

I consider that the following arguments are convincing for continuing to follow, with Murray, P's reading: (1) In this emendation τοῦτό γε is the object of ξυνεθέμην, sc. τὸ βακχεύσειν ἀεί. The text of the *Bacchae* does not in fact suggest that this is Dionysus' aim. Dionysus wants to make Thebes realize that the city has not been initiated into his mysteries (39-40) and he requires recognition, by Pentheus and by the city, that Dionysus is a god, the son of Zeus. In order to achieve this he has adopted a mortal shape; τοῦτο = τὸ ξυνθέσθαι: 'I did indeed make an agreement—that is a fact—with the god'. (2) τοῦτό γ' ἔστι 'that is a fact', 'that is indeed the case', is an obvious meaning for 5th-century Greek, and should not carry any suspicion of τοῦτ' ἔστι (τουτέστι) 'that is to say' in the Greek of the fourth century and later. Cf. τί δ' ἔστιν 'what has happened?', 'what is the matter?' (1029, *Hel.* 600, 1514); *El.* 1103 ἔστιν δὲ καὶ τόδ', 'but this too is a fact'. See also LSJ s.v. εἰμί, A III. (3) καὶ μήν in an answer is indeed strongly confirmatory (Denn. GP 354), but can contain an adversative element: Denniston 1.1. on this context and see p. 357. It is not necessary, as Dodds says, that 'we should expect an adversative particle in front of τῷ θεῷ.' For that matter, Musgrave's emendation does not lessen the adversative element in Dionysus' reply. By ξυνέθεσθε Pentheus meant: you and the Theban women. The misconception is put right by Dionysus, in any case: ξυνεθέμην says the god, not ξυνεθέμεθα. (4) Elmsley's punctuation gives a parenthetic ἴσθι, used in isolation. That seems to me a doubtful usage, at least for Euripides. Such a parenthesis is only found in A.*Su.* 459, S.*OT* 1022, [A.]*PV* 288 [in anapaests]. The first two cases occur in passages of stichomythia, where the harshness of the parenthesis is possibly softened, because in the relevant line there is no predicate. Euripides writes: (a) σάφ' ἴσθι, *Alc.* 1130, *Med.* 696, 1362, *Pha.* 52D, *Hipp.* 1331, *Ba.* 816; cf. A.*Ag.* 1616, *Cho.* 574, S.*OT* 1117, *Ph.* 122, 977, 980, 1421; (b) εὖ ἴσθι (?), Fr. 946 N² (σάφ' ἴσθι mavult Nauck), cf. εὖ τοῦτ' ἴσθι S.*OT.* 1438, *El.* 605. In Sophocles we also find the parentheses ἴσθι τόδ' ἔμπεδον and *Ant.* 758 ἴσθ' ὅτι. In other cases where ἴσθι is used without influencing the construction (that is to say without its leading to, e.g. in *Bacchae* 808, ξυνθέσθαι με ἴσθι or ξυνθέμενόν με ἴσθι) one cannot strictly speaking talk of a parenthesis. Euripides then writes: (a) εὖ δ' ἴσθι, *Andr.* 368, Hipp. 656,

Pentheus reacts as he reacted in 503 and 653. He turns his back and orders his guard: ἐκφέρετέ μοι δεῦρ' ὅπλα (bring me out my arms). And the king turns to the god again in an extreme of dramatic irony; σὺ δὲ παῦσαι λέγων (and you keep quiet!)

Now the moment has come for the god to set his second *mechanema* to work. His last attempt to experience as a mortal the revelation of his divinity to Thebes, however insincere this attempt may have been, has miscarried. Here and now, before he can go off in armour, the king is driven mad. In 810 ff. Euripides has written a scene which is, from the point of view of dramatic composition, one of his most far-reaching experiments. For in the convention of Attic tragic theatre madness scenes were prepared by a character announcing to the audience, expressis verbis, that the person concerned is or shall go mad (A. *Eum.*, S. *Aj.*, E. *Her.*, *IT*, *Or.*). In the *Bacchae* something of this sort actually happens when the stranger prays to Dionysus, 850-51: πρῶτα δ' ἔκστησον φρενῶν, / ἐνεὶς ἐλαφρὰν λύσσαν. (First take him out of his wits, giving him a giddy phantasy).

This madness will induce Pentheus to deck himself out as a maenad (851-53), and the spectators will see him in his madness, dressed up as a maenad, in the fourth episode. But in the last dialogue of the third episode there is a dramatic development: in 809 Pentheus orders his bodyguard to bring his weapons out, and in 845 he goes into the palace to consider what to do: to put on his armour or to dress up as a maenad. Between these two points lies what Dodds calls (p. 172): 'the beginning of a psychic invasion, the entry of the god into his victim'. The experiment in dramatic composition is that the audience are witness to this psychic invasion, without having had any previous intimation that the god was going to do it. Nonetheless the fact that Dionysus has already driven the Theban women mad is a presage for the audience, to help them under-

---

cf. *Fr.* 1033 N² εὖ γὰρ τόδ' ἴσθι, S.*Aj.* 1308; *Inach. Fr.* 282 P = 260 N² ἴσθι δ'. (b) ἀλλ' ἴσθι *Fr.* 1064 N², ἀλλ' ... ἴσθι *Heracl.* 598; cf. S.*OC* 254, *Ph.* 232.—In comedy ἴσθι is not found isolated in parenthesis, even less in Plato. Aristophanes writes: (a) σάφ' ἴσθι, *Ach.* 783, *Pax* 875, *Av.* 604, *Ra.* 296, 918; σάφ' ἴσθ' ὅτι *Pl.* 889; (b) εὖ ἴσθ' ὅτι *Pax* 373, *Thesm.* 12, *Pl.* 183, εὖ τοῦτ' ἴσθι *Pl.* 216, τοῦτ' ἴσθ' ὅτι *Av.* 1408. In Cratinus 222 K we read ἴσθι σαφές, undoubtedly a variant to achieve the desired cretic. Plato in parenthesis always writes εὖ ἴσθ' (ὅτι) or εὖ ... ἴσθ' (ὅτι) —(*Euthyd.* 304 d 4 ἴσθ' ὅτι cj. Heinsdorf pro οἶσθ' ὅτι). Menander repeatedly writes ἀκριβῶς ἴσθι (Austin ad *Sam.* 600).—Although ἴσθι in isolation *in parenthesi* cannot be ruled out, it does not seem to me advisable to introduce this into Euripides by way of a conjecture. For the same reason it is not possible to read, with Mette *Fr.* 1183 M σιγῶ < ∪, ἴσθι, —∪—×—∪—>. Dodds introduces a parenthetic ἴσθι into the *Bacchae* in P.Ant. 24 fr. 2ª.4 (see his Appendix p. 243). So too Willink I, 47. If the word before ἴσθι is a participle ((ἐξ)ενεγ]χών Roberts, Willink) and if my objection to ἴσθι in parenthesis is shared, the consequence must be that the line was spoken not by, but to, Cadmus, either by Agave, or by the leader of the chorus, cf. note 236.

stand what is happening to Pentheus at this moment.[197] As far as the descriptive aspect of meaning is concerned, the audience get two indications that Pentheus' reactions to the stranger are suddenly going to depart from the normal pattern: first the eagerness with which he takes up the stranger's proposal to go and look at the bacchae, while they are peacefully assembled (ἐν ὄρεσι συγκαθημένας, 811), since this is inconsistent with οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ὑπερβάλλει τάδε (for this exceeds all bounds) (785) from which it appeared that Pentheus had come to the conclusion from the herdsman's story that the bacchae were a danger to life and limb; secondly Pentheus abruptly ceases from the accusations which he has continuously been throwing at the stranger throughout the action (see note 151): he now commends him enthusiastically for his σοφία (wisdom).[198]

The events, starting from 810, have this descriptive meaning for the audience: they know and can see that the god's deceitfulness is working at full strength; but they also see that Pentheus, from whom the identity of the god and the stranger had plainly remained hidden, but who had certainly understood all along that the Lydian was playing a tricky game with him and with Thebes, from now on no longer recognizes the prisoner's deception. This is because, as *theomachos*, Pentheus had not stopped till the last moment from labelling the god, unrecognized by him in his mortal shape, as δόλιος (tricky); but now, as ἐμμανής (in his ravings) or like someone of whom μανία (madness) gradually takes possession, he can say nothing but: ὥς τις σοφὸς σὺ εἶ (how wise you are).[199]

---

[197] Cf. also 303-05: στρατὸν γὰρ ἐν ὅπλοις ὄντα κἀπὶ τάξεσιν
φόβος διεπτόησε πρὶν λόγχης θιγεῖν·
μανία δὲ καὶ τοῦτ' ἔστι Διονύσου πάρα.
Pentheus is not brought to a state of confusion by φόβος, but by ἔρως (813), sc. τοῦ βάκχας ἰδεῖν. Teiresias' words are in any case too far away, I think, to be intended by the poet as an indication to the audience of how 810ff. should be taken; we can, however, make use of them to illustrate the dramaturgy Euripides had in mind in this scene.

[198] 818 καλῶς γὰρ ἐξεῖπας τόδε, 824 ὥς τις εἶ πάλαι σοφός, 826 ἅ σύ με νουθετεῖς καλῶς, 838 ὀρθῶς. In the dialogue which immediately precedes this (787-809), Pentheus had once more expressly repeated the accusations, by attracking both the stranger's treacherous cunning (792, 800-01, 809), and his deceitfulness (805, 807).

[199] The audience know how ominous it is that the stranger lures the king to his fate, and, if they did not know it, the poet tells them again explicitly later on 848-47: Δι. ἀνὴρ ἐς βόλον καθίσταται, / ἥξει δὲ βάκχας, οὗ θανὼν δώσει δίκην. (See too n. 214). However, Pentheus calls down the threat of misfortune, which pervades the whole action, irrevocably on his head in 809. For the audience the shock comes in 812: Pentheus has his arms brought out, and orders the stranger to keep quiet. But the stranger does not stay silent, and when he has spoken Pentheus eagerly takes up his suggestion. That is the turning point in Pentheus' actions, that cannot be explained, as J. Roux does, as being irony on Pentheus' part: 'Penthée ne se doute nullement de l'importance que va prendre sa réponse. En cet instant critique, il choisit son destin. ... Sa réponse est dite sur un ton de persiflage'. Where does the 'ton de persiflage' end, and the serious dilemma of 843 begin for Pentheus? Madame Roux is silent on this, and indeed there is no change of mood, because for Pentheus there is no note of 'persiflage' from 812.

On the stage the poet does not present the process by which Pentheus loses his senses as the happening of a moment. When the god begins his psychic invasion, a dialogue ensues, in which Pentheus repeatedly delivers himself up powerless to the god (816, 818, 820; 824, 826; 830, 832, 834), and is then again overcome by shame, and by a consciousness of self-respect (822: 828; 836; 840) and finally tries to find a rationalization for his behaviour (838: 843, 845-46). From the interpretation given of the play so far, it appears that Dodds' belief (p. 172 f.) is not tenable, that the stranger in the course of the action has cleverly undermined Pentheus' 'barriers of self-control', and that his question in 811 causes the breakthrough. On the contrary, the *Bacchae* is the play of the *theomachos* who never makes a move to meet the god, whatever Dionysus says or does, and in which Pentheus forces Dionysus, in front of the audience, to give up his disguise, in order in this way to carry through the disclosure of his divinity to Pentheus and to all the Thebans.

The god's *mechanema* has two elements: it is worth distinguishing these clearly with an eye to the widely divergent interpretations of 810-46 in *Bacchae* criticism. The stranger proposes to the king that he *goes to look at* the bacchae; and as a condition of his guidance, he requires of him a *travesty.*[200] With the first proposal (811 βούλῃ σφ' ἐν ὄρεσι συγκαθημένας ἰδεῖν; 'Would you like to see them sitting huddled on the mountain side?') followed by 819 ἄγωμεν οὖν σε κἀπιχειρήσεις ὁδῷ; 'Shall we then lead you, and will you attempt the journey?', the god breaks out of his disguise, and lays an ambush. But only the audience can understand this; Pentheus cannot understand this deadly threat. As *theomachos* he would only have been able to see this proposal as a fresh peak of rudeness and trickery in the sense that he gave to the stranger's words in 805. This is not what he does; his answer in 812: μάλιστα, μυρίον γε δοὺς χρυσοῦ σταθμόν (Certainly, and give untold weight of gold to do), is one in which

[200] The trip to look at the bacchae is often described in criticism as *voyeurism*, which I find an unfortunate word for this scene: (i) To Pentheus this part of the stranger's proposition is not an invitation to perverted behaviour. One should not adduce 957-58 as evidence to the contrary, since Pentheus speaks these lines at a later stage, when his sense of reality has completely departed, cf. 945-46. (ii) Observation of the rites may have been forbidden for the uninitiated (471-72), but now that the stranger, who is an initiate, makes his suggestion to the king, he need see nothing improper in it; Cadmus and Teiresias too have visited the bacchae (1224), as has the herdsman in 680, before he and his fellows sparked off the macabre events of 734-68. (iii) Pentheus at this point is not behaving like a voyeur, since 816: σιγῇ γ' ὑπ' ἐλάταις καθήμενος is no expression of voyeurism, but of pious respect for the bacchae, just as the herdsman (677-713), before his discussions with the other herdsmen, and before the hunt had been instigated by τις πλάνης κατ' ἄστυ καὶ τρίβων λόγων (717), had watched the bacchae unobserved. Moreover, when Dionysus comments with mockery, soon to appear to be reality: ἀλλ' ἐξιχνεύσουσίν σε, κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ (817), Pentheus is eager for the alternative, 818: ἀλλ' ἐμφανῶς. καλῶς γὰρ ἐξεῖπας τόδε (τόδε Hermann, τάδε P).

madness speaks. On the other hand the second requirement of the stranger's plan, the travesty, humiliates Pentheus before the eyes of all Thebes (828, 836, 840, 854-55). It is the travesty in which the mania of the god is made manifest, and with which it will become an accomplished fact. The moment at which Pentheus wraps himself in women's clothes, because he has totally lost his appreciation of reality (850-53), is played off-stage. Before he exits Pentheus, in the last flickering of his sanity, offers opposition to precisely the travesty which is to humiliate him (822, 828, 836) and clutches at a rationalization of which up to 809 he would immediately have seen the absurdity (824, 838). The participational meaning of this scene (which is often wrongly called a seduction scene) for the audience is difficult to determine. It seems probable that Euripides intended the downfall of Pentheus, who now, resisting, sinks into his mania before our eyes, to be a terrifying spectacle, but it is conceivable that spectators of the god's dexterous game with his victim might have felt pleasure as their primary emotion.

The previous paragraphs suggest answers to a large number of the questions raised by the passage 810-46, but not to all of them. They throw some light on the process of dramatic composition of the scene; and on the descriptive and participational meanings which the audience might attach to it. Just as in the previous scenes there seems no reason here to suppose that in Pentheus Euripides had conceived a character who was limited by the repression of his own sexuality or by a Dionysiac lust for power. But the question has not yet been answered of whether Dionysus' *mechanema* has a referential relationship to the public's image of the god. For the second component of the *mechanema*, the travesty, this relationship is obvious. By his travesty Pentheus becomes a bacchant. If our ideas of bacchism are right,, *inter alia* that the bacchic dance 'induces a sense of being possessed by an alien personality', and that this dance easily develops into a 'compulsive obsession',[201] it is plain in Pentheus' travesty, and later in his dancing (see 930-31) that the king is possessed by a personality that is not his own. But it is possible that the first part of the *mechanema* too, the proposal to go and look at the bacchae, brings the audience as well into a similar relationship with the god: συγκαθημένας (sitting together) (811) reminds them of the lovely peaceful sight which the bacchae offered the herdsman on his first meeting with them (680 ff.). The herdsman's account of this sight may perhaps arouse desire in the listener, a desire of which Dionysus is the πρῶτος δαίμων (chief spirit) (378) as god of εὐφροσύνη (mirth) (377 ff., 418, 423) of freedom from care

---

201 Dodds, *Introd.* xv. See also the whole section on: 'The Nature of Dionysiac Religion', *Introd.* xiff.

(381), and of peace (419-20). It is the sudden presence of this desire in his victim which the god mockingly establishes (813): τί δ' εἰς ἔρωτα τοῦδε πέπτωκας μέγαν; (Why have you fallen into such great desire for this?).[202] Pentheus indeed belongs to the category of people, about whom the chorus has said (424): μισεῖ δ' (sc. ὁ θεός) ᾧ μὴ ταῦτα μέλει (The god hates him who has no care for this).

It is worth looking yet again at the god's psychic invasion of Pentheus as it occurs line by line in the action. The break in the stichomythia (810) marks the god's surprise at so much obstinacy, and his decision to bring his *mechanema* into action now.[203] In 811/12 Pentheus seems fully susceptible to the god's mania. The mocking question then posed by the god (813) expresses his satisfaction with the efficiency of his *mechanema*, but Pentheus takes a step back (814): λυπρῶς μὲν εἰσίδοιμ' ἂν ἐξῳνωμένας (of course I would be sorry to see them drunk).[204] The god interrupts him, and in 815, so as not to lose his hold on Pentheus, again puts a question about looking at the bacchae. The enticement in the question in 815 lies perhaps in the words ἴδοις ἂν (you could look at), the recurrent verbal expression (cf. 811 ἰδεῖν συγκαθημένας to look at them sitting together) of Pentheus' possession by the divine mania. By 816 Pentheus is again spell-bound: σάφ' ἴσθι, 'yes indeed' ('a formula of agreement', Platnauer ad A.*Pax* 875). Pentheus' enthusiasm knows no bounds (818, 820), so that the god serves up the second part of his *mechanema*: στεῖλαί νυν (gird on, now). The particle νυν (now) after the imperative (LSJ s.v. II, 3) is the expression of a certain impatience.[205] Pentheus is most alarmed

[202] I do not see any advantage in Musgrave's punctuation whether one reads two questions (τί δ'; εἰς ... μέγαν; Dodds), or one, followed by a statement (J. Roux). For δέ, cf. n. 141, Denn. GP 173.

[203] Cf. Bruhn: 'Der letzte Versuch des Gottes, den Trotzigen zu bekehren, ist gescheitert. Mit einem unwilligen ἆ leitet er die Frage ein, welche Pentheus ins Verderben locken wird'. I do not believe that ἆ here expresses 'urgent protest' (Dodds). In contexts where this is the case, the interjection is followed by an appeal not to carry out an (often aggressive) action, against which the protest is directed, cf. *Hel.* 445 (and Kannicht ad loc.), S.*OT* 1147, *Ph.* 1300, [E.] *Rh.* 687. Also *Alc.* 526 (μὴ πρόκλαι' ἄκοιτιν). Two ἆ's: *Or.* 1598 (*nisi spurius*), *Her.* 1051, where ἆ ἆ, διά μ' ὀλεῖτε is the equivalent of ἆ ἆ, μὴ διά μ' ὀλέσητε. In this context it is much better to compare *Her.* 629, where Heracles' children cling to him, and he (half annoyed, Wilamowitz) urges them to let go. When they do not do so, he expresses his surprise at such obstinacy: ἆ, / οἵδ' οὐχ ἀφιᾶσ', ἀλλ' ἀνάπτονται πέπλων / τοσῷδε μᾶλλον, and decides to give in: ναῦς δ' ὡς ἐφέλξω.

[204] We owe the emendation μέν (νιν P), as Murray reports, to Bruhn. Dodds and Winnington-Ingram (rightly, I think) accept the emendation. Verdenius' objection to it ('a pronoun seems to be necessary') is not convincing, because the god (hastily, as his *mechanema* is at risk) interrupts Pentheus (see Dodds). Pentheus' suppressed δέ-clause probably returned to his plans for a military expedition.

[205] One meets this idiom regularly in passages of stichomythia; the tone is often friendly with a slight note of superiority: the speaker knows more than the person addressed, or can see better what is going on. Cf. 1279: Κα. σκέψαι νυν ὀρθῶς· βραχὺς ὁ μόχθος εἰσιδεῖν. *Heracl.* 635, *El.* 567, *Ion* 556, *Or.* 1101, 1103. Sarcastically: *Hec.* 996, *Hel.* 450, *Or.* 1599. With tragic irony: *IA* 648.

(822): τί δὴ τόδ'; (What's this?); followed by a second question: ἐς γυναῖκας ἐκ ἀνδρὸς τελῶ; 'am I to stop being a man and rank with women?'[206] But the god's deceitfulness helps Pentheus to get over his first shock; his newly found admiration for the stranger is so great, that the latter dares to mention the god Dionysus.[207] Pentheus still has no realization of what the god is demanding of him, or, if he does realize it, he sets himself against the idea of a travesty in his questions of 826 and 828, finishing up with ἀλλ' αἰδώς μ' ἔχει (but I'm ashamed).[208] The god must again call to his aid the first part of his *mechanema*: 829 οὐκέτι θεατὴς μαινάδων πρόθυμος εἶ (Don't you want to watch them any more?), and Pentheus lets himself be told about the details of the travesty. But the travesty is still the *pièce de résistance* against the onslaught of the divine madness, 836: οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι στολήν (I could not put on woman's clothing).

The end of the dialogue between Pentheus and Dionysus presents us with serious problems in the text handed down to us in P. In 837 Dionysus tries to overcome Pentheus' αἰδώς (shame) by offering him an alternative: ἀλλ' αἷμα θήσεις συμβαλὼν βάκχαις μάχην (but you will shed blood if you offer battle to the bacchae).[209] This is precisely the alter-

[206] The question τί δὴ τόδ'; is a stronger form of τί δέ; For this last, cf. Denn. GP 175 (iv) (a), 'expressing surprise or incredulity, and usually introducing a further question (What?!)'.

[207] 825 Διόνυσος ἡμᾶς ἐξεμούσωσεν τάδε. Perhaps a sarcastic reminder (cf. πάλαι 824) of 466, which now reads, with P. Ant.: Διόνυσος αὐτός μ' εἰσέβησ', ὁ τοῦ Διός.

[208] Pentheus has expressed his approval of what the god says three times, within a few lines, using much the same words: 818 καλῶς γὰρ ἐξεῖπας τόδε, 248 εὖ γ' εἶπας αὖ τόδ', 826 ἃ σύ με νουθετεῖς καλῶς. There is, I think, a nuance of colloquiality in these answers by Pentheus, which is comparable to Stevens p. 54, under 6: 'καλῶς (εὖ) used elliptically or with ἔχειν, λέγειν, ποιεῖν to express approval and gratitude'. Gratitude of this sort is also present in Pentheus' answers, and gives a sinister ring to the dialogue. I therefore doubt the correctness of Schwinge's interpretation of 826: 'Jetzt aber greift er [Pentheus] von dionysischer Sehnsucht erfüllt sogar schon die Initiative. Er treibt, was der Gott begann, in die von diesen eingeschlagene Richtung allein von sich aus durch seine Frage voran'. I believe that πῶς οὖν γένοιτ' ἂν is not an eager question about the details of the travesty, but that Pentheus wants to know more about the good care which the stranger will take (and for which he is grateful to him) to protect him against the fury of the bacchae. Again, as it seems, Pentheus has to be told in 827 that he must dress himself as a bacchant, which he fails to understand, 828: τίνα στολήν; Then he remembers the god's words in 821. This moment of remembrance is behind his next question: ἦ θῆλυν; and he opposes it with all the strength he still possesses: ἀλλ' αἰδώς μ' ἔχει.

[209] αἷμα θήσῃ (see Dodds) would, so far as Greek goes, make better sense. But the active: 'you will cause a bloodbath' (cf. Verdenius) is more attractive dramatically; the god does not refrain from expressing himself ambiguously whenever he can (cf. 839, 844). Objections have also been raised against the meaning of the line as such; A. E. Housman (see Dodds) suggested: ἀλλ' εὐμαθὴς εἶ (= ibis) συμβαλῶν βάκχαις μάχην; ('What, will you let yourself be recognised and so join battle with the Bacchanals?'). H. D. Broadhead, *Tragica* 117f.: ἀλλ' εἰ μεθήσεις, ξυμβαλεῖς βάκχαις μάχην ('If you neglect to do this (sc. to don female garb), 'you will be joining battle with the Bacchanals'). The solution of this problem lies, I think, in that of 842ff.; see below.

native that Pentheus until shortly before, after the herdsman's story (778 ff., 796 f.), had seen as the only way out. Pentheus answers (838): ὀρθῶς (right), but it then seems that he does not mean ὀρθῶς αἷμα θήσω (I will be right to shed blood), but ὀρθῶς ἔλεξας: μολεῖν χρὴ πρῶτον εἰς κατασκοπήν (you're right; we must first go and do a reconnaisance).[210] This use of ὀρθῶς (right), together with Pentheus' immediate capitulation to the god's new argument (which is in fact a rewording of Pentheus' own original intention), makes it doubtful whether Euripides did indeed mean the two lines 837-38 in this way. In 839 the god expresses his satisfaction that Pentheus, thanks to the attack of madness, appears to be a good student of Dionysiac σοφία (wisdom). In his next question Pentheus wants to know how he can *also* (καί 840) be unobserved in his travesty by the men of Thebes, and the god gives a straight answer. But 842 does not make sense as a reaction to Dionysus' assurance, that he shall see to it that Pentheus shall be taken by lonely roads to Cithaeron, unseen by the Thebans: πᾶν κρεῖσσον ὥστε μὴ 'γγελᾶν βάκχας ἐμοί ('γγελαν Pierson, Reiske; γελᾶν P) (anything is better than that the bacchae should laugh at me). At this time Pentheus is, after all, apprehensive of the ridicule of the men in the city, not of that of the women on the mountain. It also appears from 843, ascribed to Pentheus, that we are dealing with a corrupt text: ἐλθόντ' ἐς οἴκους ἂν δοκῇ βουλεύσομαι (we will go inside, I will decide what seems best). The asyndeton of this new turn in the conversation, taken by the same speaker, is unacceptable: the break in the stichomythia is suspect. There have been varying opinions about the acceptability of the anacoluthon. A great many emendations have been suggested for 842-43.[211] The dialogue is closed with two lines by Pentheus, who then

---

[210] In *Ion* 1025 one can imagine: ὀρθῶς sc. ἔλεξας, but more obvious is ὀρθῶς sc. ἐγὼ παῖδα δόξω διολέσαι. *Hipp.* 94 ὀρθῶς γε sc. μισεῖται τὸ σεμνὸν κτλ. Elsewhere in Euripides we have in full ὀρθῶς ἔλεξας, *Ion* 745, *Or.* 100, 110. We would not have had this problem if the text had read καλῶς, a colloquialism: 'good', 'OK'. Cf. *Ion* 417 and *Or.* 1216, Stevens p. 54, and note 208 above.

[211] 842 for βάκχας: Θήβας Jacobs (or ἀστούς, 'wenn der Vers ... an seiner Stelle wäre', Wecklein in the *Anhang* of his school edition). The previous owner of my copy of Sandys' edition, R. P. Baker, notes in the margin: 'vel fortasse (sc. mutandum est) in βακχῶντί μοι'. (Euripides, it is true, does not use βακχάω, but cf. A.*Sept.* 498).—Versum spurium ducit Middendorf; 'recte' iudicat Nauck.—Post 844 transposuit H. Behrns.—Post 842 lacunam statuit Kirchhoff.—Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* 59f., cf. 241 sub C, tries to improve on Kirchhoff's suggestion by his own proposal of:

843^{a} Δι. ἐλθόντ' ἐς οἴκους <οἷα χρὴ στειλώμεθα.
843^{b} Πε. ἐπίσχες· αὐτὸς> ἂν δοκῇ βουλεύσομαι.

Dodds finds this an attractive suggestion—ἐλθὼν Kirchhoff; ἐλθών γ' Nauck.—J. Roux takes 843 for an antilabe, (i.e. two speakers to the line): Dionysus before the caesura, Pentheus after it. She makes a remarkable error, because she defends ἂν δοκῇ (sic P): 'si tu permets', apparently taken over without further thought from E. L. B. Meurig Davies REG 61 (1948) 366: 'ἂν δοκῇ asks permission, given in ἔξεστι': ἂν for ἤν is unheard of in literary Greek in the fifth century.

goes into the palace (845-46). Dionysus speaks two lines to the chorus (848-47), which have come down to us in the wrong sequence in the manuscript (see Dodds).

Any reconstruction of what Euripides wrote must start with that part which seems most certain. Line 843 appears to be correct, and to have been spoken by Pentheus. The anacoluthon 'reflects Pentheus' wavering state of mind' (Dodds): to the last moment Euripides keeps up the tension on whether the god's *mechanema* will work (cf. 845-46); a tension that is only released in 848. The dramatic composition is much stronger if we set aside 842, as we have already been tempted to do on other grounds: content, asyndeton, and the coercion of the stichomythia. Now the god's reassuring words (841: ὁδοὺς ἐρήμους ἴμεν· ἐγὼ δ' ἡγήσομαι) (We will go by deserted ways; I will lead you) cause an enthusiastic reaction from Pentheus: ἐλθόντ' ἐς οἴκους (sc. οἷα χρὴ στειλώμεθα) we will go inside (sc. to get ready)), cf. Jackson, and cf. 820, 838. But then the king restrains himself, again overcome by shame: ἂν δοκῇ βουλεύσομαι (I will decide what seems best). The god, sure of his power, answers: ἔξεστι (so be it), and Pentheus goes indoors with a dilemma, the decision on which has already been taken for him by the god. Line 842 is thus banished from its place, but it is not spurious. The line belongs after 837. In 837 the god mockingly offers Pentheus the alternative to the travesty, bloodshed, which until 809 was just what the king intended. In the last and strongest flickerings of his sane mind Pentheus approves of this bloodshed: πᾶν κρεῖσσον ὥστε μὴ 'γγελᾶν βάκχας ἐμοί (anything is better that that the bacchae should laugh at me). Expectation is again aroused that the *mechanema* is *capable* of failure. But with one remark, which has been lost, the god recaptures his victim. In this line the god doubtless used the first component of his *mechanema*, the sight of the bacchae (cf. 815, 829). The text of 836-46 which results from this suggestion is consistent, and I think less speculative than removing the difficulties by emendation. Moreover the suggestion deserves preference over Jackson's (who, like Kirchhoff, assumed a lacuna), because it also explains βάκχας in 842 and removes the problems of 837-38. The text of 836 ff., with a supplementary line 842a being offered exempli gratia,[212] then reads:

Πε. οὐχ ἂν δυναίμην θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι στολήν.
Δι. ἀλλ' αἷμα θήσεις συμβαλὼν βάκχαις μάχην. 837
Πε. πᾶν κρεῖσσον ὥστε μὴ 'γγελᾶν βάκχας ἐμοί. 842
< Δι. ἴδοις ἂν αὐτὰς μᾶλλον ὑπ' ἐλάταις λαθών. > 842a

[212] ἴδοις ἂν αὐτὰς μᾶλλον, cf. 794: θύοιμ' ἂν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον, and see my comment on the 'enticement' ἰδεῖν p. 84; ὑπ' ἐλάταις, cf. 816; λαθών, cf. 840, 817, 954. For the whole couplet 842a-838 cf. 1061-62.

Πε. ὀρθῶς· μολεῖν χρὴ πρῶτον εἰς κατασκοπήν. 838
Δι. σοφώτερον γοῦν ἢ κακοῖς θηρᾶν κακά.
Πε. καὶ πῶς δι' ἄστεως εἶμι Καδμείους λαθών; 840
Δι. ὁδοὺς ἐρήμους ἵμεν· ἐγὼ δ' ἡγήσομαι. 841
Πε. ἐλθόντ' ἐς οἴκους — ἂν δοκῇ βουλεύσομαι. 843
Δι. ἔξεστι· πάντῃ τό γ' ἐμὸν εὐτρεπὲς πάρα.
Πε. στείχοιμ' ἄν· κτλ. 845

The third episode is brought to an end with a rhesis by Dionysus, 848/7-861. In the first two lines Dionysus directs himself to the chorus and re-establishes the fiction that he is a stranger from Lydia, in whose snares Pentheus lies entangled (cf. 849 οὐ γὰρ εἶ πρόσω). Then follows a prayer to Dionysus (849-53) in which the audience are informed directly that Pentheus' mania will have as consequence that he will clothe himself as a bacchant.[213] This explanation is necessary to clarify the descriptive aspect of what has gone before for all the spectators, i.e. that the god Dionysus is driving Pentheus mad, in order to fulfil the revelation of his divinity to him and to all the Thebans.[214] Dionysus tells them what he wants (854-56) and what he is going to do (857-59).[215] The rhesis (849-61) therefore has the character of a fresh prologue, a prologue to the fulfilment of the divine punishment, and therefore to the revelation of Dionysus' divinity. The imminence of this revelation is communicated to the audience in the last words of the rhesis: 'he will recognize Dionysus, son of Zeus...', this being the ultimate goal towards which the whole plot has been directed.[216]

---

[213] Dodds wrongly ad 854-55: 'The Stranger's insistence on dressing up Pentheus as a woman has to be motived, since the King was quite willing to go ἐμφανῶς (818)'. However, this ἐμφανῶς refers to the possibility, not of looking at the bacchae σιγῇ δ' ὑπ' ἐλάταις καθήμενος 816 (as indeed any man would have looked, and probably precisely as the herdsman had, 680ff.), but of openly going to meet them, since hiding from them no longer made sense, κἂν ἔλθῃς λάθρᾳ 817. The theme of the travesty is touched upon for the first time in 821.

[214] Schwinge (p. 379f.) has attacked Merklin's suggestion at this point (cf. above p. 13): 'Denn eine Erklärung, die eine Stelle eines Dramas allein vom Späteren her deutet und dabei völlig von derjenigen abweicht, die sich an der betreffende Stelle selbst ergibt, kann nicht als legitim bezeichnet werden'. Merklin had used as motive for his argument (op. cit. p. 155 n. 3): 'aus Gründen der dramatischen Ökonomie nachgeholte Erklärung und Exposition einer bereits begonnenen Entwicklung'. But from what has gone before it is clear that 812 *suo loco* shows that Merklin has interpreted the passage correctly, though this need not alter the fact that 849ff. is to some extent a reminder to the audience of what is happening. Besides it is necessary that all the audience understand at this stage that Dionysus has driven his opponent mad, otherwise Pentheus' next entrance (918) loses its effect. The result of the dramaturgic experiment (the god's psychic invasion of Pentheus) is secured by the most traditional method (telling the audience expressis verbis).

[215] To the audience Διόνυσε, νῦν σὸν ἔργον κτλ. (849ff.) was a soliloquy. From 854 χρῄζω δέ νιν γέλωτα Θηβαίοις ὀφλεῖν its character changes slightly. The reason put forward by the *stranger* (to the chorus?) for wanting to make Pentheus ridiculous in the eyes of the

The fourth episode (912-976)

A study of the action in the fourth episode needs no long nor detailed discussion. What is played out before the spectators' eyes is crystal-clear; in *Bacchae* criticism there are no deep-lying differences of opinion to be found in the interpretation of this scene on its own. The god first appears (912) coming out of the palace, and can therefore impress upon the audience that the person who is about to enter is Pentheus: Πενθέα λέγω, 'I mean Pentheus', 913. The Pentheus who appears next (917), 'ist ganz schon Kreatur einer anderen Macht' (F. M. Wassermann (1929) 279). He, to whom the god wished to prove his divinity (θεὸς γεγὼς ἐνδείξομαι, 'I will show myself to be a god' 47), has himself become the proof of Dionysus' divinity. He sees two suns and two Thebes (918-19), and perceives in the stranger the appearance of a bull (920-22).[217] This implies an epiphany of the god, see p. 142. Pentheus' madness is theatrically presented in three different ways in what can most appropriately be

---

Thebans is ἐκ τῶν ἀπειλῶν τῶν πρίν, αἷσι δεινὸς ἦν (856). But this cannot be the god's reason (cf. 1349). In Pentheus decked out as a maenad Dionysus reveals his divinity, δεικνὺς ἐμαυτόν (50).

[216] I cannot share the objections which have been made to the text of the manuscript: γνώσεται δὲ τὸν Διὸς / Διόνυσον, ὃς πέφυκεν ἐν τέλει θεὸς / δεινότατος, ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἠπιώτατος. (i) ὡς πέφυκεν Dobree. Dodds is inclined to accept the emendation. But I do not believe that the relative presents a problem, provided we do not conclude from it that the stranger means: 'He shall learn what Dionysus is' (Dodds), but understand the relative clause as being strictly relative: 'He will get to know the son of Zeus, Dionysus, who ...' (ii) ἐν τέλει is not the same as εἰς τέλος 'in the end', 'in the long run' (LSJ s.v. II.2.b). It is also stronger than τέλος used adverbially, 'finally': the revelation of Dionysus' divinity to Pentheus is, for the god at least, the end and the fulfilment of the dramatic action. All his activity has been directed to this end. At the moment of this fulfilment (1077ff.) he disappears definitively as stranger from our field of view. This fulfilment begins at the moment that the god drives Pentheus mad. This is the point of no return. Pentheus 'will get to know the son of Zeus, Dionysus, of whom it shall finally, in the outcome, be made plain that he is the most fearfull of all gods,—*and* full of kindness for humanity.' Πεφυκέναι in the sense 'to be seen to be' is also used in 896 τό τ' ἐν χρόνῳ μακρῷ νόμιμον ἀεὶ φύσει τε πεφυκός, see Dodds' interpretation. The whole antistrophe of the third stasimon 882-96 is in any case a working out of ὃς πέφυκεν ἐν τέλει θεὸς / δεινότατος, and this stanza again takes up the theme from the first antistrophe of the first stasimon (386-401): τὸ τέλος δυστυχία.

[217] In 618ff. the god had encompassed the presence of two figures of himself in the stables: besides his own likeness there was also a bull for Pentheus to worry about. I do not believe that in 920 Pentheus sees two figures of the stranger before him (Dodds; an 'attractive suggestion' comments Winnington-Ingram, p. 117 n. 1). (i) This is not apparent from the text, τεταύρωσαι γὰρ οὖν even suggests the opposite; (ii) ὁ θεὸς ὁμαρτεῖ (923) is an answer to ἡγεῖσθαι and one of the god's old tricks, cf. 518. Pentheus in his mania has already discovered what is still hidden from the chorus and from the Thebans, that the stranger and the god are one and the same. The conclusion that Pentheus would have drawn from this realization, if he had not lost his wits, would have been to give up his theomachy. But nothing happens; his insight is of no avail to him: νῦν δ' ὁρᾷς ἃ χρή σ' ὁρᾶν. The same words are spoken with tragic irony in *Ion* 558, where Xuthus says them to Ion, who submits to the obviously correct explanation of Apollo's oracle.

called an ecce-scene.[218] There is scarcely question of dramatic development, except that Pentheus and the stranger set out on their way to Cithaeron.[219] Pentheus' mania is given dramatic form first in a physical manifestation showing that his perception has been altered (918-24); second, in the picture of his travesty (925-44); third, in the psychic manifestation that he has completely lost his sense of reality (945-64). Each section ends with a satisfied statement from the god that his *mechanema* is having the desired effect.[220] In the third section Pentheus imagines how, taking cover among the fir trees, he will watch the maenads: 'wie Tauben schnäbeln dort/die Liebespärchen brünstig im Gebüsch' (translation by von Wilamowitz, 957-58). Here the king's earlier anxieties about what the women might be doing on the mountain (221-25) are perverted by the divine mania into prurient fantasy,[221] and the god jeeringly informs his victim that he, the king, who protects the welfare of his people, is undertaking his journey just for that reason.[222]

---

[218] I contrast 'ecce-scene' with 'action scene', following Gerd Kremer, *Die Struktur des Tragödienschlusses* in W. Jens ed., *Bauformen* 117ff., who speaks of 'Ecceschluss' versus 'Handlungschluss'. In an ecce-scene the action does not build up extensively (by the expansion of dramatic activity), but intensively (by the development in depth of a dramatic situation) towards the full achievement of dramatic reality. Elsewhere I have called this 'situation drama' (Lampas 8 (1975) 244).

[219] By saying this I do not in the least mean to show my agreement with J. Roux, p. 527: 'La tragédie ne consistera plus qu'en une série de tableaux édifiants'.

[220] 924 νῦν δ' ὁρᾷς ἃ χρή σ' ὁρᾶν, 944 αἰνῶ δ' ὅτι μεθέστηκας φρενῶν, 964 τοιγάρ σ' ἀγῶνες ἀναμένουσιν οὓς ἐχρῆν (fortasse οὕς σ' ἐχρῆν). The god is himself so surprised by the grotesque eruption of madness in 945-46, that he immediately comments, 947f.: τὰς δὲ πρὶν φρένας / οὐκ εἶχες ὑγιεῖς, νῦν δ' ἔχεις οἵας σε δεῖ—this is possibly a sarcastic reference to 262: the travesty works beyond expectation. In 944 αἰνῶ δ' ὅτι μεθέστηκας φρενῶν not only expresses approval, but even *gratitude* that Pentheus is such a dedicated pupil (βάκχῃ μᾶλλον εἰκασθήσομαι 942). For αἰνεῖν as an expression of thankfulness compare 10 αἰνῶ δὲ Κάδμον, ἄβατον ὃς πέδον τόδε / τίθησι and J. H. Quincey, *Greek Expressions of Thanks.* JHS 86 (1966) 144ff., particularly 147 'αἰνεῖν with a ὅτι clause' (*Ba.* 944, *IA* 506-07, 821-24).

[221] The sexual connotations of 957-58 are perhaps strengthened by the comparison ἐν λόχμαις ὄρνιθας ὥς. For λόχμη cf. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* 136 (and see above n. 144), by ὄρνιθας ὥς the audience were reminded of the nightingale, the swallow, and the thrush, which were suggestive of the female sexual organ (Henderson 147). One can further compare: Ar. *Aves* 223-24 ὦ Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ, τοῦ φθέγματος τοὐρνιθίου· / οἷον κατεμελίτωσε τὴν λόχμην ὅλην. But Winnington Ingram's declaration, p. 119: 'There is no denying the prurience of Pentheus now' must, I think, be answered by 'yes and no'. Pentheus is depersonalized by the god, cf. 956 ἐλθόντα δόλιον μαινάδων κατάσκοπον, where δόλιος cannot have the active sense that it normally does when used of persons. It is certainly not Pentheus' δόλος, which makes him go and spy on the maenads, but that of the god: ἐλθόντα δόλιον μαινάδων κατάσκοπον = ἐλθόντα δολίῳ θεοῦ τέχνῃ μαινάδων κατάσκοπον. For this passive use of δόλιος cf. E. *El.* 166, cl. *El.* 9-10.

[222] 959: οὐκοῦν ἐπ' αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἀποστέλλῃ φύλαξ. The stranger uses the word φύλαξ in the sense of 'warder', as can be seen from the context, and as he was himself once the object of Pentheus' desire to confine people, 497: Πε. εἱρκταῖσί τ' ἔνδον σῶμα σὸν φυλάξομεν. But in his answer Pentheus' madness goes off into another fantasy: he is the protector of the city, and as such displays admirable daring.

The whole couplet is spoken by Dionysus to Pentheus' face: 'That is what thou goest to see, / Aye, and to trap them—so they trap not thee!' (Murray).[223] Where Dodds, p. 192, speaks of 'a bizarre and terrible humour' in this scene, this lies, I think, in the exuberance with which Pentheus and Dionysus make merry over the rest of Thebes, men and women alike. They have something in common, in which the others have no share, because the god is an ally to them both (923-24). When Pentheus has heard the god's words about his φυλακή (watch), his great task stands clear in his sight; he will now go as a hero through the streets of Thebes.[224] And the god sings his praise (963-64): μόνος σὺ πόλεως τῆσδ' ὑπερκάμνεις, μόνος· / τοιγάρ σ' ἀγῶνες ἀναμένουσιν οὓς ἐχρῆν (alone you bear the burden of the city, alone indeed: therefore the ordeals await you which you have earned). From line 961, (κόμιζε, convey me), Pentheus and Dionysus are about to depart for Cithaeron; the end of the dialogue between them produces an atmosphere that is completely different from that of the sexual fantasies in the previous lines. The image conjured up by 961 ff. is one of τόλμα, ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως κάμνειν, ἀγών, πομπὸς σωτήριος (courage, bearing the burden of the city, ordeal, a guide and saviour). Is this combination of words designed to produce a referential aspect of meaning for the audience? Dodds and J. Roux point out that πόλεως τῆσδ' ὑπερκάμνεις (bearing the burden of the city) allocates to Pentheus the function of φαρμακός (scapegoat). Through his suffering and his death the king reconciles the god with the city.[225] Winnington-Ingram (p. 120, cf. p. 24 n. 3) believes that Pentheus is compared with an athlete who competes for his city. Basing himself on καλλίνικος (he who is gloriously triumphant) (1147, 1161) he assumes that this meaning was intended by Euripides and understood by his public. I do not believe that Dodds can be right: so far as we know nothing in the outcome of the tragedy points to a reconciliation between Dionysus and Thebes (cf. note 43) as one would have expected if Pentheus had filled the role of φαρμακός (scapegoat); Winnington-Ingram's solution is possible, but rests here only on ἀγών (ordeal) and ὑπερκάμνειν (to labour for). Another interpre-

---

[223] 960 ἢν σὺ μὴ ληφθῇς πάρος were understood by Wilamowitz and Dodds as an aside, but see Winnington-Ingram p. 117; David Bain, *Actors and Audience. A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*, (Oxford 1977) 47. Otherwise Schwinge, p. 407: 'Pentheus indessen hört diesen letzten Worten nun bereits gar nicht mehr zu'.

[224] Compare too David Bain's comment on 960 (op. cit. 47): 'It is possible that "if you are not caught first yourself" is ... an extra piece of titillation for Pentheus, reminding him of the risks he is taking'. In this sense the god's words, 959f., are the preparation for a heroic fantasy by Pentheus, see below.

[225] The terms πομπή (cf. πομπός 965, 1047), ἀγών (964, 974, 1163) and κῶμος (1167, cf. 1172) should indicate a ritual pattern, cf. G. Thomson, *Aeschylus and Athens*, London [2]1946 139ff., 167.

tation may be more probable: the referential meaning which I wish to advocate for 962-64 is that the god is delivering the funeral oration in advance for one who has fallen for his city. The only fifth-century epitaphios of which we have sufficient knowledge is Pericles' funeral speech (Thuc. 2.35-46), but it is precisely the ideals expressed in this speech, to which Euripides refers. After all, we find the train of thought from 962-64 in the same sequence in Pericles' epitaphios, where in Thucydides' version the concepts of τόλμα (courage) (41.4), ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως κάμνειν (bearing the burden of the city) (41.5) and ἀγών (ordeal) (42.1) are referred to.[226]

The distichomythia (change of speaker every two lines) in which the greater part of the episode is written, changes to hemistichomythia (change of speaker every half line) in 966-70. The god, as πομπὸς σωτήριος (guide and saviour), will take Pentheus to his destination. But when the time for death comes to Pentheus, the god will turn away from him, just as Artemis does in the *Hippolytus*: 'another shall bring you back from there'. To Pentheus, the god's references to his death[227] are another incentive. First he was a spy on the maenads (956), then the only man to dare the deed (962), now he will be faring softly, entertained with gentle care (ἐν ἁβρότητι τρυφῶν). The god ends the dialogue, as if he was irritated with so much incomprehensible sensual desire for death: 'so soft indeed' (τρυφάς γε τοιάσδε). Pentheus takes to the road, full of expectation: ἀξίων μὲν ἅπτομαι, 'I go to claim my due'.

The episode ends with a six line speech from Dionysus, in which the god again points out the fame that Pentheus will get by his death. 971 was certainly never uttered as an aside.[228] Just as in 970 Dionysus ended his

---

[226] I refer also to the following correspondences: the anaphora of μόνος in 962-63, and the anaphora of μόνη in Thuc. 2.41.3; Pentheus' pride in this ἀνδρεία and τόλμα (962) is further expanded by the god in the πόλεως τῆσδ' ὑπερκάμνεις, and the ἀγῶνες of 963-64, cf. Thuc. 2.39.4; Pericles also praises τόλμα as a political virtue in 40.3 and 43.1 (compare on the other hand for the pejorative meaning of the word in the older tragedy Irena Zawadzka, *Eos* 54 (1964) 44-55, in Polish with a summary in Latin). For ἀγῶνες compare Thuc. 2.46.1. Pericles goes on to emphasize in his argument that the τόλμα of the Athenian dead must not be confused with the ἀμαθὲς θράσος, with which life is sacrificed under other political systems (cf. Thuc. 2.40): the preservation of life is rightly to be desired. Pentheus is called ἀμαθής by the god (480, 490), but for him the loss of his ἀμαθία will mean the loss of his life. The god's scorn in his Periclean interpretation of Pentheus' use of the word τολμᾶν possibly introduces a conceptual aspect of the *Bacchae*'s meaning, cf. p. 174. Finally, one must sometimes set παθεῖν higher than the preservation of life (Thuc. 2.42.4, cf. n. 228). There is some sarcasm in the god's offer to the madman of himself as πομπὸς σωτήριος (965): Pentheus stays safe as long as (the god of) madness escorts him, but he is lost the moment that both the god, and the madness, abandon him, see p. 95f.

[227] ἐπίσημον 967 (cf. (?) Thuc. 2.43.2 τὸν τάφον ἐπισημότατον); φερόμενος ... ἐν χερσὶ μητρός 968-69.

[228] πάθη: 'the sufferings inflicted by the King' (Sandys) is impossible (see Dodds); but that Dionysus should speak the words 'to Pentheus' retreating back' (Dodds) spoils the ef-

conversation with Pentheus in a rather matter of fact way (τρυφάς γε τοιάσδε) (so soft indeed), so his solemn sounding appeal to the absent Agave and her sisters to perform the work of their hands is ended in a rather matter of fact way with a colloquial τἄλλα δ' αὐτὸ σημανεῖ, 'the rest, the event itself will show' (cf. Stevens, p. 53).

The descriptive meanings of the scene as played have been sufficiently outlined: we have watched an 'ecce-scene' in which the bewildering action of the divine mania is shown consistently in a number of aspects. It seems more difficult to establish the participational meanings adequately. Dodds writes, p. 192: 'As Hermann said, the groundlings will laugh and are meant to laugh; but for the sensitive spectator amusement is transmuted into pity and terror'. Such a distinction between the dress circle and the gallery seems of only limited value: if a scene has comic effects, these result from the conscious intention of the author, and he has himself experienced them as comic. A moment of comedy in the action can naturally be used ironically to strengthen some contrasting emotion in the audience (of pity, bewilderment, horror) cf. *IA* 819 ff., but these moments in themselves still retain their comic force. However, the question of whether Pentheus driven mad was an object of amusement for his public can hardly be answered in the affirmative. Insanity was not considered funny in classical Greece: Aeschylus (*Cho.* 467-68) calls insanity παράμουσος ἄτας αἱματόεσσα πλαγά (harsh bloody blow of delusion), 'denn der Stachel des Wahnsinns, die Meute der Unterwelt, die dionysische Höllenraserei sind ja keine blossen Bilder, sondern dabei empfindet der Hellene den religiösen Schauer: grauen muss einem davor, als ob man das wilde Heer uber sich ziehen hörte' (von Wilamowitz, *Her.* commentary III.196).

---

fect of the compliment made him by the god in 972 (cf. Bain 47). Willink II 231f. believes that the words were said to Pentheus' face 'in a tone of humouring admiration', after which Dionysus leads Pentheus to the exit, 'perhaps with an affectionate arm round his shoulders'. Schwinge (p. 410) suggests that Pentheus ignores the last word of 971: 'siegestrunken ... gar nicht mehr aufnimmt'. But in this scene it is irrelevant what could, or could not, have been said to Pentheus. To the madman anything can be said, and what is said, can be said to his face. The macabre aspect of the situation is much more effectively invoked for the audience by the way in which Euripides lets the god do this, than it would have been by a blunt announcement of his forthcoming death, cf. Willink. It is then evident that πάθη here cannot have an 'innocent meaning' (as Bain thinks). On the contrary, Pentheus is gripped by his great task, the idea of μέγας ἀγών (974f. τὸν νεάνιαν ἄγω / τόνδ' εἰς ἀγῶνα μέγαν, cf. Thuc. 2.45.1: παισὶ δ' ... ὁρῶ μέγαν τὸν ἀγῶνα); now that he has completely lost his sense of reality, he is not to be put off by fear of death, but behaves like an equal of those of whom Pericles said (Thuc. 2.42.4): ἐλπίδι μὲν τὸ ἀφανὲς τοῦ κατορθώσειν ἐπιτρέψαντες, ἔργῳ δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἤδη ὁρωμένου σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἀξιοῦντες πεποιθέναι· καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι καὶ παθεῖν μᾶλλον ἡγησάμενοι ἢ τὸ ἐνδόντες σῴζεσθαι. And does not Pentheus know that he has a πομπὸς σωτήριος with him?

If we compare the second episode with the fourth, we see that the same Dionysus is presented to us in each: a smart young Lydian, who looks lovely with his smiling mask and long curly hair. But the fierce young king has been replaced by a vain fool in women's clothes. Yet in the action we were able to get to know Pentheus better than Dionysus, who hid himself in, or behind, the beautiful Lydian, and as a most terrible god (θεὸς δεινότατος) Dionysus is recognizable in the king driven mad rather than in the person of the smiling stranger, particularly in the spectacle offered by the king as a bacchant, in his experience of the divine manifestation, in his dressing up, and in his loss of any sense of reality. For the audience the descriptive and referential aspects of the fourth episode are therefore principally that they are confronted with divine power (ὅ τι ποτ' ἄρα τὸ δαιμόνιον 894), which manifests itself in a gruesome way.[229]

The fifth episode (1024-1152)

In the last episode the audience hear in a messenger speech how the god's sentence of death on Pentheus is accomplished. The structure of the narrative consists of a wide-ranging depiction of the events which lead to the sparagmos, and of a speeding up of the story of the catastrophe itself: the journey 1043-57 (15 lines); the fir tree as Pentheus' observation post 1058-74 (17 lines); the call for vengeance 1075-94 (approx. 19 lines); Pentheus is dragged down 1095-1113 (approx. 19 lines); the sparagmos 1122-36 (15 lines); Agave's κῶμος (revel) 1137-47 (11 lines). In the middle of the story come 1114-21 (8 lines), in which Pentheus is restored to reality from his madness and undergoes his fate in acknowledgement of the god's power. The harrowing climax of the narrative comes when it is two-thirds over (66/71: 33 lines),[230] in 1114: πρώτη δὲ μήτηρ ἦρξεν ἱερέα

---

[229] One can see then that Euripides used both the god's masquerade in the guise of a human, and the metamorphosis of the king into a bacchant, as theatrical devices to ensure that the god Dionysus was not himself a dramatis persona in the sense of a character who defends points of view, and declares opinions. (I except the god's epiphanies in the prologue and the exodos). I have therefore suggested (p. 49) that Euripides has deliberately not allowed Pentheus and the stranger to argue with each other in a formal agon, but has chosen a substitute (Teiresias) for the stranger; and that the Teiresias scene in the first episode is a more or less free-standing segment within the course of the action. The god himself hides behind tricks and deceit: the deceit of his disguise, and the tricks of his *mechanemata*.

[230] The numbering 66-71 is dependent upon the number of lines that are considered as interpolations. In criticism suspicion has fallen on the following lines:

1091-92 non habet P. Oxy. 2223.—They are both rejected by Dodds and R. Merkelbach, RhM 97 (1954) 374 n. 3. (Paley and Wecklein already suspected 1091). Verdenius defends their authenticity: 'the over-fullness of expression seems to be characteristic of the messenger's style'. J. Roux rejects 1091 and keeps 1092.

1098 eiecit P. J. Meier, *Kritische Bemerkungen* (Progr. Braunschweig 1885) 12. Bruhn and Wecklein agree. Dodds defends the line. The papyrus has it.

φόνου (first his mother, as priestess, started the slaughter), to be followed by a second climax, that visually is perhaps even more horrible, just before the end of the story, 1141: (κρᾶτα) ... *πήξασ' ἐπ' ἄκρον θύρσου .../ φέρει* (his head ... she bears fixed on the top of her thyrsus)).[231] These two moments have a descriptive meaning; in them the dramatic activity of the events on Cithaeron reach their peak. The meaning which the audience attaches to those points in the messenger speech, when the chief characters of the drama are quoted literally, is better considered as participational. In line 1079 ff. the god calls his maenads for the revenge he has thought out for Pentheus. In 1118 ff. Pentheus tries by referring to his father Echion to bring his mother out of her madness and recognize him.[232] In 1145 ff. Agave sings out her triumph. These three points concentrate the broad narrative of the messenger speech down to the subjective utterance of a single character in the play; this leads to a *strengthening* of the spectator's involvement (of identification or of alienation) because he can see the whole dramatic situation in all its aspects, and can experience and evaluate the irony which is inherent in such a subjective utterance. This is also the case with the two other quotations in the messenger speech 1059 ff. (Pentheus) and 1106 ff. (Agave), but here the emotional charge of their utterances is less: they do not, to the same extent as the other three, mark the decisive dimensions from which the chief characters act out the drama on Cithaeron, the god's lust for revenge, Pentheus' death agony, and Agave's mad triumph.

'Pentheus dies sane and repentant' writes Dodds ad 1117-21. As long as the god is with him as the stranger, he is ruled by madness. In this

---

1104[a]. The papyrus adds a line: βάκχαι τὰ Πενθέως .[....].πι.τω] according to the transcription by the first editor, C. H. Roberts,—Campbell defends the line and restores: βάκχαι τὰ Πενθέως [ἀθλίου] πι[σ]τώ[ματα]. Merkelbach l.l.374f. considers the line an interpolation πρὸς σαφήνειαν τῶν λεγομένων: 'Damit auch der Dümmste das Subject nicht verkennen möge, wird es in einem ganzen Vers nachgetragen'. Here Dodds agrees; against Campbell's restoration he argues that Roberts suspected an σ or an ε before πι. These traces have now disappeared: according to the photograph (in B. E. Donovan) the gap occurs up to just before the π. Merkelbach too prints ..]πι. A decision seems to me difficult; if Campbell's restoration πιστώματα is correct, this is a striking apposition to ῥίζας, that one would not expect in a fill-up line, which did not originate from the poet, but from an interpolator. If one accepts 1104[a] as authentic, it seems to me that the word before πιστώματα would rather contain some qualification of this last word than a repeat of the assertion that Pentheus in his tree was ἄθλιος or τλήμων (cf. 1102). I would therefore prefer to write, for example: βάκχαι τὰ Πενθέως [ἀσθενῆ] πι[σ]τώματα, cf. 882-83: πιστόν <τι> τὸ θεῖον σθένος.

1108 post caesuram—1109 ante caesuram eiecit Paley; Merkelbach agrees 1.1. 374 n. 3.

1113 eiecit Nauck; Wecklein agrees (*Comm.* ²1902), Merkelbach l.l.

[231] In the herdsman's speech too, 677-768, there is a climax after two thirds of the narrative: 737ff. (sparagmos of the cattle, 60: 31 lines). The second climax (omophagy of the children), comes right at the end, 767-68.

[232] Cadmus will follow the same road in 1273 and 1275.

state he speaks the words 1059 ff. in which he declares that he cannot properly see the maenads' evil (νόσοι (cf. 353) and shameful deeds, αἰσχρουργία).[233] The madness leaves him presumably at the moment that the god leaves him, and his call for revenge rings round the valley; ἀπορίᾳ λελημμένος trapped helplessly) (1102) is indeed a statement by the messenger, but it informs us that Pentheus, if he had not been so pitiably trapped, would have sought safety in flight.[234] Pentheus dies with his mind clear, as the ancient idea of revenge demands (Arist. *Rhet.* 1380 b 23, cf. note 157). But does he also die repentant? Pentheus' words form an intensive series of terms which describe his relationship with Agave: μῆτερ—παῖς σέθεν—ἔτεκες—μῆτερ—παῖδα σόν (mother—your son—whom you bore—mother—your son). He never turns to the god, no ἠδίκηκα (I wronged you), no λίσσομαί σε (I pray to you), no ὕβρισά σε (I insulted you) passes his lips (cf. in contrast the dialogue between Cadmus and Dionysus in 1344-48). As far as the god is concerned, it is enough for Pentheus to recognize that he judged the situation wrongly: ταῖς ἐμαῖς ἁμαρτίαισι (my mistakes). Because this situation involves a god, the recognition means, it is true, that Pentheus accepts the god's divinity, but he bows before superior strength, before violence. It is not the god, but his mother to whom he appeals for mercy (οἴκτιρε 1120), and his recognition of *hamartia* is too ambivalent to assume any repentance or even perhaps an idea of *hubris* in Pentheus. Agave too, when she is released from the violence of the Dionysiac mania, will attack the god almost bitterly (1296) and turn away from him (1384-87).[235]

[233] Unlike Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* 213, I believe that the emendation of νόθων in 1060 οὐχ ἐξικνοῦμαι μαινάδων ὅσοι νόθων is indeed compelling; Pentheus cannot describe the maenads as νόθαι in the way that, when he was still sane, he talked about πλασταὶ βακχεῖαι (218). Canter's ὅσσοις for ὅσοι P is therefore not sufficient, and I read, with Jackson, οὐχ ἐξικνοῦμαι μανιάδων ὅσσοις νόσων. Νόσων emphasizes ironically (οὐχ ἐξικνοῦμαι ... ὅσσοις), just as does αἰσχρουργίαν (1062), Pentheus' pitiable state of mind in his madness, see p. 90 and n. 221 ad 957-58. The corruption νόθων is obvious, seeing the easy confusion between Θ and Σ in uncials (Jackson); perhaps a part was played by the copyist having already read the next word ὄχθων (ὀχθῶν Dodds). The next corruption, μαινάδων, was then of course inevitable. Verdenius prefers μαινάδων ... νόσον.

[234] Dodds differs, putting the moment of Pentheus' release from his madness at 1115f.: 'along with the ritual μίτρα he has discarded the madness which he acquired when he put it on' (ad 1117-21). But this magical explanation is not in accordance with the text: (i) putting on the mitra was a *consequence* of a mad state of mind (see 851-53): (ii) discarding the mitra is a *consequence* of a sane outlook: ὥς νιν γνωρίσασα μὴ κτάνοι, 1116; (iii) in so far as μανθάνειν is a significant word in the *Bacchae* (Winnington-Ingram p. 165), and for this reason alone one considers 1113 as authentic, κακοῦ γὰρ ἐγγὺς ὢν ἐμάνθανεν means that Pentheus' consciousness of reality, and with it his common sense, have at that moment returned, cf. the situation of Agave in 1296.

[235] Winnington-Ingram goes even less far, p. 165f.: 'He understood his physical danger; of greater insight there was, and could be, nothing, nor should we read too much into his ultimate admission of error'. For the ambivalence of ἁμαρτία cf. J. M. Bremer's study of the word in Arist. *Poet.* and in Greek tragedy, particularly p. 37: 'one has to

The exodos (1165-1392)

The sparagmos of Pentheus is the proof that Dionysus gives of his divinity to him and to all the Thebans (cf. 47-48). The god's deceit by which he operated in Thebes as a Lydian stranger is one reason why this proof is only given to the king of Thebes in the hour of his death. Thus the god denies himself Pentheus' libations and prayers, which he desired so urgently before (45-46). He wants them no longer, since he decided on his second *mechanema* and drove Pentheus mad. The plot of divine punishment does not, however, end with Pentheus' destruction, but rushes on irresistibly: in the final act of the tragedy all categories of Thebans are affected by the god's damnation[236]. With hindsight, Teiresias' words 208-09 were a sinister prophecy: ἀλλ' ἐξ ἁπάντων βούλεται τιμὰς ἔχειν / κοινάς, δι' ἀριθμῶν δ' οὐδὲν αὔξεσθαι θέλει, 'but he wants to have honour in common from everyone, he does not wish to be exalted by just one of their number'.[237] In this final act Pentheus is present, dead, upon the stage, his head triumphantly impaled on his mother's thyrsus, the scattered remains of his dismembered corpse collected and brought on to the stage by his grandfather. This spectacular tableau is one of the bloodiest that Euripides has designed in all his works, and perhaps the most gruesome;[238] it is typical too of Euripides (unlike Sophocles in such cases) that this bloody tableau takes place in a scene that does not aim primarily at arousing fear, but pity, not so much for himself as for his mother and

---

maintain the basic ambiguity of the *hamart*-words: the only way to determine their meaning is to refer to the immediate context'. Apart from that Bremer takes the meaning of ἁμαρτία here as 'offence' and not as 'error' (p. 35 n. 36). I differ from him in our opinion on the operation of the Dionysiac mánia, when he writes about Pentheus, p. 185: 'The aggressive mania, of which Teiresias had accused him earlier (326, 359), is turned by the god into a submissive mania'.

[236] For the reconstruction of the end of the *Bacchae*, see Willink, I 44-49. Willink rightly argues for two lacunas of considerable size. I have two additions to his suggestions: (i) In the first lacuna (after 1300) there was not perhaps a speech, but a monody, by Agave. She then closes her dirge for Pentheus' death with one or more spoken lines, in which she asks her father what Pentheus had done wrong (1301: Πενθεῖ δὲ τί μέρος ἀφροσύνης προσῆκ' ἐμῆς;) Then Cadmus conjures up the image of the living Pentheus in the lines that have been preserved 1302-26. (ii) Cadmus' rhesis is closed with two lines by the leader of the chorus (1327-28); then Agave speaks again, when she ascribes the gruesome events to mania, hers and her sisters' (cf. Apsines, *Rhet. Gr.* Walz ix 587 κατηγορεῖ μὲν αὐτῆς, ἔλεον δὲ κινεῖ), and perhaps begs Cadmus to take on himself the care of Pentheus' burial. The last lines of her speech are then perhaps P. Ant. 24 fr. 2ª.3-4 (cf. above note 196 in fin.). Her rhesis too is then closed by two lines by the leader of the chorus, P. Ant. 24 fr. 2ª.5-6: ὁ ταῦτ' ὅπω]πὼς ἐκδιδαχ[θήτω βροτῶν· / Διόνυσον] ὁ Ζεύς ἐστιν ὁ [σπείρας θεόν, suppl. Dodds e.g. Then Dionysus enters, either announced or not, for his epiphany.

[237] I follow Dodd's word-division.

[238] Not listed by Joachim Dingel, *Requisit und scenisches Bild in der griechischen Tragödie*, in Jens, *Bauformen* 364 under 'Das Spektakuläre'.

her father Cadmus.[239] Even after his death, Pentheus still has a role to play in the *Bacchae's* action; from being a dramatis persona, he was depersonalized by Dionysus into a bacchant; after his sparagmos, his head in Agave's triumph is used by the god as an instrument to further the revelation of his divinity to Agave and all the Thebans. Agave's plaint is lost to us, but not Cadmus' rhesis (1302-26) in which he makes a dignified and moving protest against his grandson's depersonalization by the god (1316 f. καὶ γὰρ οὐκέτ' ὢν ὅμως τῶν φιλτάτων ἔμοιγ' ἀριθμήσῃ, τέκνον, 'though you no longer live, you shall be counted among those dearest to me, child'), and as a last impression for the audience, evokes the living reality that was Pentheus before Dionysus set foot in Thebes.

[239] In his spectacular productions Sophocles makes use of blood and violent physical injury (*Ph., Tr.*) to make the audience shudder. These productions strengthen the poet's intention of making his characters suffer, physically and psychologically, exposed and without mercy; Sophocles is the 'Entdecker des extremen Leids' (W. Schadewalt *Sophokles und das Leid* (Potsdam 1947) 19). Euripides uses blood less, and when he does, directs his audience's attention more to the οἶκτος in others' suffering, cf. *Andr.*, *Tro.*, *Her.* In the *Hecuba* Polymestor's bloody return to the stage is all part of Hecuba's revenge, and is closely linked with the scene in which she is confronted with her dead son Polydorus, 681ff. In the *Bacchae*, according to Apsines (*Rhet. Gr.* Walz ix 590) there must have been the following scene: τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον κεκίνηκεν Εὐριπίδης οἶκτον ἐπὶ τῷ Πενθεῖ κινῆσαι βουλόμενος. ἕκαστον γὰρ αὐτοῦ τῶν μελῶν ἡ μήτηρ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ κρατοῦσα καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν οἰκτίζεται. The implication of this quotation, that Agave proceeds on the stage to a *compositio membrorum* (a spectacle which would be more likely to arouse φόβος than ἔλεος) has rightly been opposed by Willink I, 45; I share his supposition 'that κρατοῦσα merely indicates the stage-directions of late antiquity'.

DIONYSUS

INTRODUCTION TO CHAPTERS SIX, SEVEN, AND EIGHT

The plot of the *Bacchae* differs from almost all the plots of Greek tragedies known to us by the fact that for a great part of the play a god, Dionysus, appears on the stage in the role of an actor playing his own part. If we look only at the surviving plays of Euripides, this difference is even sharper: first, because in Euripides the appearance of gods on the stage takes place almost exclusively in the prologue and/or during a theophany in the exodos, and secondly because the gods' *acts* are generally accomplished out of the audience's sight (Athena in the *Heracles*). Moreover the god's appearance in the *Bacchae* (at least up to the moment of his theophany in the exodos) is marked by the fact that he has taken on the shape of a mortal (4, 53, 54) and that he is therefore the god Dionysus for the audience, but not for the characters in the play.

On p.14 it is argued that the plot of the *Bacchae* can be better studied if one uses the role of Pentheus as a starting point and continually questions the motive of his actions, than if one follows a similar process with the role of Dionysus, whose double role, at the same time both god and Lydian stranger, means that one must constantly decide whether he is speaking as a god or as the stranger, and that one risks jumping to conclusions on the grounds of the referential and conceptual meanings possible at the various points of the action. But, as has been pointed out, the audience is after all aware of the stranger's true identity, and their response to the action is determined by their greater knowledge of the facts, and their view of the situation as a whole. This greater knowledge of the facts lies above all in the fact that the audience, unlike Pentheus, know that the god Dionysus (at least in the theatrical reality of the *Bacchae*) really exists. The author and his Athenian public start with a number of assumptions about the god; we can justifiably say that the appearance of the god Dionysus in the action of the *Bacchae*, apart from his concrete actions, by which the poet has given the plot its form, has in itself a complex of referential meanings for the audience. These referential aspects of the meaning of Dionysus' appearance in the *Bacchae* are principally studied in chapters 6 to 8. In this study there are two questions: from what common assumptions do the poet and his public start in their image of the god Dionysus, and what expectations could the public have had of a god who appeared on the Athenian tragic stage, taking part in the action?

The aspects in which the god Dionysus was worshipped are examined in chapter 6. These aspects are twofold: on the one hand Dionysus is the god of the carefree joy which he grants with his wine and his festivals; on the other he is the god of an orgiastic ritual, which brings his worshippers to an extremely intense state of mind, a combination of ecstatic joy and vehement horror, cf. Dodds, *Introd.* xvi f., who quotes Plutarch, *Def. Orac.* 14.417 c: ἡμέρας ἀποφράδας καὶ σκυθρωπάς ἐν αἷς ὠμοφαγίαι καὶ διασπασμοί. These are also the aspects of the god in the *Bacchae*, so Euripides has given to his play a referential aspect of meaning in that the portrayal of the god's behaviour points to the audience's perception of him in real life.

Another referential aspect of meaning is studied in chapter 7, namely the aspect that Dionysus—just as other gods— is a *theatrical convention*: in the reality of the audience as theatre-goers, gods appear or appeared on the stage as part of the action. Euripides handles this convention in a way which is unique in his work, but one which shows an affinity with epic convention (the Homeric hymn to Dionysus) and with the convention of Aeschylus' theatre.

But from one point of view this affinity between the treatment of Dionysus in the *Bacchae* and its predecessors in earlier literature is completely lacking, namely that the god's appearance among mortals on Euripides' stage is an irrational occurrence. For Dionysus is pre-eminently the god of epiphany: as god of wine, as god of the Dionysiac festivals, and as the orgiastic god. From the moment that Dionysus appears on the stage as a Lydian stranger, until his last epiphany before the defeated Cadmus and Agave, Euripides has loaded his appearance with such irony that the behaviour of the god in his epiphany appears to be the overriding referential aspect of meaning. This behaviour of the god in his epiphany is studied in chapter 8.

It is this referential aspect of meaning, rather than the descriptive aspect of meaning of the downfall of the house of Cadmus, which removes any grounds for the idea that Euripides in the *Bacchae* was in any way honouring the god. This idea belongs to the conceptual aspect of meaning, which is not discussed until chapter 11. The utterances of the chorus are also important for any statement of the poet's concept. Their relationship with the action is not only discussed in chapters 6 to 8, but also in chapter 9, and chapter 10 is devoted to them exclusively.

CHAPTER SIX

DIONYSUS (1): THE GOD IN THE LIFE OF THE ATHENIANS

The god of euphrosyne

For the Greeks, at any rate for the Athenians of the classic period, Dionysus was in the first place the god of wine. He is presented as such in Teiresias' first argument (278-85) and has been sung as such for centuries by the poets. As god of wine he was called χάρμα βροτοῖσιν (a joy for men) by Homer (*Il.* 14.321); that this description does not apply to the god of ὄργια (the mysteries) is acceptable if one compares Hes. *Fr.* 239 M.-W[240] For the rest Homer maintains a noticeable silence about Dionysus as the god of wine; G. A. Privitera sought an explanation for this in the aristocratic society of the Iliad and the Odyssey described by the poet, for which the sacred quality of wine is not a major aspect.[241] This is changed by the time of Hesiod: wine is the gift of Dionysus, the god of exuberant joy.[242] In lyric poetry we meet Dionysus principally as god of wine, but at the same time there is a development in the representation of the god, which gives a far wider significance to his function in cultural and social life.[243] It is still uncertain, however, whether this development stems ex-

---

[240] οἷα Διώνυσος δῶκ' ἀνδράσι χάρμα καὶ ἄχθος·
ὅστις ἄδην πίνῃ, οἶνος δέ οἱ ἔπλετο μάργος,
σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε δέει γλῶσσάν τε νόον τε
δεσμοῖς ἀφράστοισι, φιλεῖ δέ ἑ μαλθακὸς ὕπνος.
1 = *Sc.* 400 2 pro οἶνος: θυμὸς mavult West.

[241] *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia greca arcaica* (Roma 1970) 96: 'la larga disponibilità di vino, come di grano, nelle case signorili ha offuscato del tutto la sua valenza sacrale; il suo uso è regolato dall'ethos di gruppo; il trasgressore page con il suo prestigio'.

[242] Hes. *Op.* 613f.: ἔχτῳ δ' εἰς ἄγγε' ἀφύσσαι / δῶρα Διωνύσου πολυγηθέος. Cf. *Th.* 941. Pindar picks up the epithet in an avowedly sacramental mood (*Fr.* 153 Sn.): δενδρέων δὲ νόμον Διώνυσος πολυγαθὴς αὐξάνοι, ἁγνὸν φέγγος ὀπώρας.

[243] Cf. Privitera pp. 96ff. He distinguishes (pp. 9f., 143ff.) two traditions in the treatment of Dionysus in archaic lyric poetry. One tradition, conventional and aristocratic, is connected with Homer; we find this in, particularly, Alcaeus, Theognis, and Pindar: 'Questa tradizione non era affato ostile a Dioniso: soltanto, prescriveva che fosse celebrato nei canti a lui destinati e lo escludeva dagli altri che non fossero adatti, per la loro stessa natura, ad esprimere compiutamento l'ethos dionisiaco' (p. 144). Besides this Privitera distinguishes another tradition, which he finds in Hesiod, the Cycle, and Anacreon, 'più sensibile alle nuove istanze etiche e sociali ed alla crisi dell' antico ordinamento politico; più incline a superare i confini tra i generi poetici, pur di esprimere adeguatamente i nuovi contenuti; disposta a celebrare Dioniso al di fuori dei canti suoi propri' (p. 145f.). I am not convinced by Privitera that there are two distinct traditions for the treatment of Dionysus in archaic poetry: (1) in which tradition did Archilochus write? *Fr.* 120 W. ought to be classed in the aristocratic tradition: Dionysus is hymned in what is,

clusively from Dionysus' function as god of wine. Some think that Dionysus was originally a god of vegetation, and particularly of arboriculture, and from this became more specifically a wine god.[244] But it is possible that Dionysus was a wine god in origin, that is to say he was the power in the fermenting grape juice, and that from this status he became god of all that is liquid in nature, of the life-giving sap in man, beast and plant,[245] and became associated with the goddess of agricultural fruitfulness, whose πάρεδρος (associate) he was called.[246]

God of wine, and god of liquid nature: these are also the aspects which were celebrated in the oldest Dionysian festival in Attica, the Anthesteria. There is not probably any connection between Dionysus and the last day of the Anthesteria, the Chytroi,[247] but there is no doubt that on the first two days of the festival, the Pithoigia and the Choes, it is Dionysus to whom libations are offered, and that as god of the budding vegetation, and of the splendour of flowers in the early spring, it is he who then returns home across the sea and fulfills the male role in the ritual of the ἱερὸς γάμος (sacred marriage). Similar divine attributes were

---

par excellence, the Dionysiac genre, dithyramb; but the inscriptions found in the Archilocheion on Paros (SEG 15.517 A (E 1) III 16ff., *Fr.* 251 W., cf. Treu p. 46 and pp. 280f.) can hardly be reconciled with a traditional character for his poetry. (2) A difference of content between the second, later, tradition compared with the first ('pur di esprimere adeguatamente i nuovi contenuti', Privitera p. 146) does not seem to me plausible. For Alcaeus too, Dionysus is λαθικήδης in a drinking song (346 L.-P.); Theognis 975-76 is the expression of a sentiment which is no different from that in Hesiod. It seems much more likely that the political and social shifts in late archaic society worked strongly to the favour of the meaning and cult of Dionysus; the ideal of sympotic euphrosyne (see below) became much wider and more democratized, in the sense that it was no longer an exclusive form of aristocratic social behaviour, but a mass life style, which in Attica was principally expressed in the dramatic festivals. (3) Privitera rightly refers (p. 120ff., contrary to von Wilamowitz and others) to the importance given to Dionysus by Pindar. But it is not fair for Privitera to restrict his enthusiasm for Dionysus to Pindar's dithyrambs, and to see a deliberate denial of the god in the rest of his work (p. 138). The exceptions are too numerous for this (i.e. *I.* 7.3-5, *Pae.* 4.25, *Fr.* 29.5, 153 Sn.); it is precisely the enthusiasm of the aristocratic poet Pindar which indicates the expansion of Dionysus in the social and cultural life of the late archaic and classical periods.

[244] Nilsson GGR I 585, cf. Dodds *Introd.* xii. The name (of the god?) appears on the clay tablets from Pylos (cf. Privitera p. 14 n. 2), and this detracts from the certainty of Nilsson's statement: 'Der Weinbau ist aber in Griechenland viel älter als Dionysos, und so ist Dionysos nachträglich in die mit dem Weinbau verbundenen Braüche hineingekommen, soweit er mit ihnen in Verbindung gebracht wurde'.

[245] Cf. Pi. *Pae.* 4, 25f. (*Fr.* 52d Sn.) εἰ καί τι Διωνύσου ἄρουρα φέρει βιόδωρον ἀμαχανίας ἄκος.

[246] Pi. *I.* 7.3-5. Antiquity gave two explanations for this association (cf. Σ Pi. *I.* 7.3). One, κατὰ τὸν μυστικὸν λόγον, is: ὅτι παρεδρεύει αὐτῇ ὁ ἐκ Περσεφόνης γεγονὼς Ζαγρεὺς Διόνυσος, ὁ κατά τινας Ἴακχος. The other explanation κατὰ τὸν φυσικὸν λόγον, is: ἐπειδὴ τῇ ξηρᾷ τροφῇ, ᾗ ἀνάκειται τῇ Δήμητρι, παρέπεται ἡ τοῦ οἴνου χρῆσις. Teiresias too uses this second explanation, *Ba.* 275ff.

[247] Nilsson GGR I 594ff., Jacoby, *Fr. Gr. Hist.* III^{b} Suppl. i, 364ff. Pickard-Cambridge DFA^{2} 13ff.

celebrated at the festival of Haloa in Poseideon, the month during which the Rural Dionysia were celebrated as well. In Attica Dionysus shared the Haloa with Demeter and Kore.[248] The Icarius-aition is connected with the Haloa;[249] the aischrology and the strong sexual orientation of the Haloa rituals form a connecting link between Demeter and Dionysus, and σκώμματα (insults) are found in both the Lenaea and the Choes (*Phot.* s.v. τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἁμαξῶν). Moreover, it is generally accepted that there was apparently no procession for Dionysus, being the cult of a fertility god, without phalluses being carried in it (cf. Nilsson GGR I.590 f).[250] Aischrology and phallophoria were essential distinguishing signs of Dionysus' worship in Attica, and have acquired an enduring monument in the survivals of ancient comedy.

If we now try to envisage the meaning that Dionysus had for the audience of the *Bacchae* in these functions for which he was primarily known in Attica (wine god, fertility god, spring god), and if we leave out of consideration, for the moment, the god of the Dionysiac *orgia,* we have good grounds for characterizing this meaning to a large extent by the concept of 'euphrosyne'.

Euphrosyne had already been linked by Homer with, among other things, wine.[251] It is 'Freude als erstrebenswerte Hochstimmung, als der "Frohsinn", der sich dann einstellen kann, wenn der Sinn frei und unbeschwert von sorgenvolle Gedanken ist'.[252] Sympotic euphrosyne is described by Xenophanes (*Vorsokr.*[5] 21 B 1); to him euphrosyne is as it were the wine itself;[253] at the same time, compared with *Od.* 9. 5 ff., the sacred character of euphrosyne is much more strongly emphasized. The purity and festive nature of a symposium have their counterpart in the behaviour of the guests, for whom euphrosyne was defined as τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι πρήσσειν (to be able to act rightly).[254] The qualities ascribed by

[248] Deubner *Attische Feste* 60ff. It is a festival ἐν ᾗ ... Δημήτηρ καὶ Βάκχος συμβαίνουσιν (Himer. *Or.* 8.3). Nilsson (GGR I 467) comments that the Dionysiac element in this festival cannot be set aside, as Deubner (p. 64) is inclined to do.

[249] Scholion on Lucian, 280.5ff. Rabe, printed by Deubner p. 61 n. 5.

[250] Evidence is lacking of φαλλοφορία for the πομπή during the Lenaea. On the other hand this element is naturally strongly represented during the comic performances, which from the beginning appear to have played a much more prominent part in this festival than did performances of tragedy (Pickard-Cambridge DFA[2] 40f. and cf. 41 n. 1)

[251] *Il.* 3.246: οἶνον, ἐύφρονα καρπὸν ἀρούρης. Euphrosyne of the repast: *Od.* 9. 5-11. Cf. Joachim Latacz *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg 1966) 165f.

[252] Latacz p. 164. He cites (p. 162) Ammonius *Diff.* 510: εὐφροσύνη δὲ πάθος χρόνιον μετὰ σωφροσύνης γινόμενον.

[253] 4: κρητὴρ δ' ἕστηκεν μεστὸς ἐυφροσύνης.

[254] 12ff.: μολπὴ δ' ἀμφὶς ἔχει δώματα καὶ θαλίη.
χρὴ δὲ πρῶτον μὲν θεὸν ὑμνεῖν εὔφρονας ἄνδρας
εὐφήμοις μύθοις καὶ καθαροῖσι λόγοις,
σπείσαντάς τε καὶ εὐξαμένους τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι
πρήσσειν.

Xenophanes to the euphrosyne of a symposium are a clear illustration of how this idea had crystallized at the end of the archaic period. In the first place a strengthening of the sacred element has been introduced. Wine is a gift of Dionysus,[255] but it is a gift with a twofold power. On the one hand in presenting wine to humanity the god gives joy which drives away care and grief.[256] On the other there is in wine a power over men's minds, which can not only remove euphrosyne, as when the drinker lets his heavy head sink on his chest (Alc.*Fr.* 358 L.-P) and is overcome by sleep,[257] but which can also change euphrosyne into its opposite and lead to hubris.[258] To avoid an act of hubris, says Xenophanes, those taking part in the symposium must make libations to the god and pray to him, τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι πρήσσειν (to be able to act rightly). How different is the relationship between the drinker and his wine in epic: there too there is naturally the idea that the drinkers must behave themselves properly, but the control of this is of a strictly social character; anyone setting himself outside this control must pay with loss of prestige.[259] He does not load himself with guilt, but with shame; ill luck affects him personally.[260] In

---

[255] Hes. *Op.* 614, Thgn. 976, Alc. *Fr.* 346 L-P.

[256] Alc. *Fr.* 346.3f. L-P: οἶνον γὰρ Σεμέλας καὶ Δίος υἶος λαθικάδεον / ἀνθρώποισιν ἔδωκε. Cf. Cypr. *Fr.* 10 Ki., Thgn. 883, Simon. 4 W., Ion Lyr. *Fr.* 744 PMG, Dionysus as παυσίλυπος in the *Bacchae*: 281ff. (Teiresias), 423 (the chorus), 771 (the herdsman).

[257] Privitera (p. 118) categorizes this as the negative aspect of wine, and he refers to Hes. *Fr.* 239 M-W (quoted in n. 242). Cf. Panyas. *Fr.* 12. 16-18 Ki.:

τῷ σε χρὴ παρὰ δαιτὶ δεδεγμένον εὔφρονι θυμῷ
πίνειν, μηδὲ βορῆς κεχορημένον ἠύτε παῖδα
ἧσθαι πλημύροντα, λελησμένον εὐφροσυνάων.

In the *Bacchae* Teiresias appraises sleep as a positive gift from the god, 282f.: ὕπνον τε λήθην τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν κακῶν / δίδωσιν, οὐδ' ἔστ' ἄλλο φάρμακον πόνων. The chorus speaks in the same way (385): ὁπόταν ... κισσοφόροις δ' ἐν θαλίαις ἀνδράσι κρατὴρ ὕπνον ἀμφιβάλλῃ. Elsewhere in Euripides the sleep of a drunken man is given a negative value (*Fr.* 1079 N²): οὐκ ἔστι λύπης ἄλλο φάρμακον βροτοῖς / ὡς ἀνδρὸς ἐσθλοῦ καὶ φίλου παραίνεσις· / ὅστις δὲ ταύτῃ τῇ νόσῳ ξυνὼν ἀνὴρ / ... (lac. indicavit Nauck) ... / μέθῃ ταράσσει καὶ γαληνίζει φρένα, / παραυτὰ δ'ἡσθεὶς ὕστερον στένει διπλᾶ.

[258] Xenophanes *Vorsokr.*⁵ 21 B 1.16ff. (the preceding lines were quoted in n. 254):

ταῦτα γὰρ ὦν ἐστι προχειρότερον,
οὐχ ὕβρεις· πίνειν δ' ὁπόσον κεν ἔχων ἀφίκοιο
οἴκαδ' ἄνευ προπόλου μὴ πάνυ γηραλέος.

Cf. Panyas. *Fr.* 13.7ff. Ki. (and, for other references on this topic, Ath. 36^{a}-37^{b}):

ἀλλ' ὅτε τις μοίρης τριτάτης πρὸς μέτρον ἐλαύνοι
πίνων ἀβλεμέως, τότε δ' Ὕβριος αἶσα καὶ Ἄτης
γίνεται ἀργαλέα, κακὰ δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὀπάζει.

[259] Antinous urges Odysseus (*Od.* 21.293f.): οἶνός σε τρώει μελιηδής, ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους / βλάπτει, ὃς ἄν μιν χανδὸν ἕλῃ μηδ' αἴσιμα πίνῃ. Drunkenness, in Homer, means loss of face, *Il.* 1.225, *Od.* 19.122.

[260] Antinous' example of the Centaur Eurytion (*Od.* 21.295ff.): ὁ δ' ἐπεὶ φρένας ἄασεν οἴνῳ, / μαινόμενος κάκ' ἔρεξε δόμον κάτα Πειριθόοιο. Because ἄτη elsewhere in epic always indicates a divine intervention (Dodds *The Greeks etc.* 5), we are left in uncertainty here: is Eurytion's ἄτη (cf. 301f.: ὁ δε φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἀασθεὶς / ἤιεν ἣν ἄτην ὀχέων ἀεσίφρονι θυμῷ) brought on by himself or by a god (in which case the wine is only wine) or by a divine

the sixth century we do find an idea of guilt:[261] those taking part in a symposium strive for a common ideal of euphrosyne. If good order is disrupted, the consequences are much more serious than that one individual is stripped of prestige: the much more fundamental value of δίκη (rightness) is threatened. So euphrosyne has been put in a sacred context, which in the epic it had to a much lesser degree or not at all.[262] And the god who is closely linked to this sacred aspect of the euphrosyne of the symposium is the wine god Dionysus.[263]

In the second place, in the social and political upheavals of the seventh and sixth centuries euphrosyne did not remain within its aristocratic foundations of the symposium, but became linked with new ideas about society. Solon refers to sympotic euphrosyne to explain his ideas of εὐνομία (the rule of good laws) and its enemies, κόρος (insolence) and ὕβρις (hubris).[264] Ἀρετή (virtue) and σοφία (wisdom), which are striven after in sympotic euphrosyne, acquire a moral and religious change in Xenophanes' τὰ δίκαια δύνασθαι πρήσσειν (to be able to act rightly).[265]

Euripides makes the chorus of the *Bacchae* in the first stasimon assert an ideal of life which has much in common with these earlier opinions. In their choral prayer to Piety the chorus introduce sympotic euphrosyne most strikingly. The introduction to it is not an obvious one at that point

power in the wine? This last is less likely if we compare Elpenor's drunkenness: Odysseus has no high opinion of him (*Od.* 10.552f.): νεώτατος, οὔτε τι λίην / ἄλκιμος ἐν πολέμῳ οὔτε φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἀρηρώς); he himself laments (*Od.* 11.61): ἀσέ με δαίμονος αἶσα κακὴ καὶ ἀθέσφατος οἶνος.

261 See Dodds' chapter 'From Shame-Culture to Guilt-Culture' in *The Greeks etc.* 28ff.

262 Latacz discusses (p. 167) the negative tone that the word sometimes has in Homer, e.g. in *Od.* 20.8 εὐφροσύνη and in *Od.* 17.531 εὔφρων. The change of meaning of euphrosyne to a purely pleasant connotation can perhaps be connected with the fact that poets like Anacreon (*Eleg. Fr.* 2 W.) and Xenophanes (*Vorsokr.*[5] 21 B 1.21ff.) did not want to hear about civil discord and wars at symposia, nor about mythical instances of the strife of the Titans, or the war between Centaurs and Lapiths. Anacreon asks that the speaker at a symposium: ἐρατῆς μνήσκεται εὐφροσύνης and Xenophanes wishes: ὡς ᾗ μνημοσύνη καὶ τόνος ἀμφ' ἀρετῆς. Theognis agrees with this (763f.): πίνωμεν χαρίεντα μετ' ἀλλήλοισι λέγοντες, / μηδὲν τὸν Μήδων δειδιότες πόλεμον, cf. 789-94. This too argues against Privitera's idea (see n. 243) that there were two differing traditions for the treatment of Dionysus in archaic poetry; it is true that Theognis does not mention Dionysus here by name, but neither do Anacreon or Xenophanes in the passages quoted.

263 Dionysus becomes more closely and personally involved with those taking part in a symposium: Ion of Chios calls him οἶνον ἀερσίνοον, ἀνθρώπων πρύτανιν (744 PMG), and εὐθύμων συμποσίων πρύτανι (*Eleg. Fr.* 26.14 W. = von Blumenthal). The chorus in the *Bacchae* call him τὸν παρὰ καλλιστεφάνοις εὐφροσύναις δαίμονα πρῶτον μακάρων (376ff.).

264 *Fr.* 4.7-10 W.: δήμου θ' ἡγεμόνων ἄδικος νόος, οἷσιν ἑτοῖμον
ὕβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἄλγεα πολλὰ παθεῖν·
οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον οὐδὲ παρούσας
εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.

265 Cf. Theognis 789-94, read as a whole (cf. 731-52). Ion of Chios ends a prayer to Dionysus (*Fr. Eleg.* 26.15f. W.): δίδου δ' αἰῶνα καλῶν ἐπιήρανε ἔργων / πίνειν καὶ παίζειν καὶ τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν.

of the dramatic situation, in which Pentheus on one side and Teiresias and Cadmus on the other have been quarrelling violently about the existence or not of the god Dionysus.[266] But the link is that in the course of archaic time Dionysus had become the πρῶτος δαίμων (chief spirit) of sympotic euphrosyne, which in its turn became the model for a more extensive complex of ethical and religious values, so that Pentheus' hubris can be demonstrated by references to that euphrosyne.[267] In the first antistrophe the chorus speak of unbridled mouths (ἀχάλινα στόματα) and of lawless folly (ἄνομος ἀφροσύνη), in both cases aiming at Pentheus. These ideas are opposed to the life of quietness (ὁ τᾶς ἡσυχίας βίοτος) and to sensible thinking (τὸ φρονεῖν). The first opposition, that between ἀχάλινα στόματα and ἡσυχίας βίοτος, is possibly also (but not only) a reference to the war-weary escapism of the period (cf. Dodds ad loc.); the second, however, that between ἄνομος ἀφροσύνη and τὸ φρονεῖν, has an archaic ring: the combination of εὐφροσύνη, εὐνομία and τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν is familiar to the Athenian public from their poets of antiquity. So the chorus link traditional and more topical values to one Dionysiac ideal of life in τὸ σοφὸν δ'οὐ σοφία/τό τε μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν, 'it is not wisdom to be clever—to think beyond the boundaries of mortality'.[268]

---

[266] Cf. Deichgräber (1935) p. 338: 'Das orientalische Element der Ekstase ist vor der Idee der hellenischen εὐφροσύνη zurückgetreten, der εὐφροσύνη die gerade—so schliesst sich das Lied zu einer Einheit zusammen—die frommen Dionysos-gläubigen erfüllt'.

[267] In 378 we must construe the genitive μακάρων as partitive with δαίμονα, not as possessive with εὐφροσύναις. The strophe is not about a feast of the gods, since the μάκαρες θεοί know no sorrow for Dionysus to soothe (ἀποπαῦσαί τε μερίμνας, 381). The ἐν δαιτὶ θεῶν of 383 (Dodds: an epic phrase) refers to a repast of ἄνδρες—as for the divine guests whom Euripides imagines for such a meal one should perhaps think of Ὁσία, Εὐφροσύνη, Δίκη, Εὐνομία *e tutti quanti*. Cf. Critias 6 D. 18-21.

[268] The text should be punctuated in this way according to, inter alios, Elmsley, Bruhn, Wecklein, Murray and J. Roux. Others follow the Aldine: τό τε μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν βραχὺς αἰών, 'not to think like a mortal means a short life'. Thus, inter alios, Hermann, Sandys, Deichgräber, Dodds, Winnington-Ingram. Both interpretations can be defended, and it is not correct that 1004 βροτείως ἔχειν ἄλυπος βίος is decisive for the second punctuation (Winnington-Ingram p. 63 n. 1), since ἄλυπος βίος and βραχὺς αἰών are not comparing like to like, even if this had not always been so, cf. Homer's version of the Lycurgus myth, *Il.* 6, 130-1: οὐδὲ γὰρ ... Λυκόοργος / δὴν ἦν, ὅς ῥα θεοῖσιν ἐπουρανίοισιν ἔριζεν. I prefer to put a stop after φρονεῖν: (i) the paradox τὸ σοφὸν οὐ σοφία needs an explanation—what then is τὸ σοφόν if it is not "wisdom"? It is explained more fully by τὸ μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν, linked with the previous words by the appositional τε (Denn. GP 502). In this way τὸ σοφόν is explained; a fourth phrase, stating the meaning of σοφία is lacking, but in the context of Dionysiac euphrosyne it is clear what this wisdom means for the chorus: τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν. (ii) I shall refer later (p. 108) to a passage from Pindar's ode for Strepsiades, *I.* 7.39-48, which seems to me an illuminating parallel to the first stasimon as a description by the chorus of the Dionysiac attitude to life. It seems to me that Euripides by his statement βραχὺς αἰών means no more than Pindar does with his statement *I.* 7.44: βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν, and both in the sense that life is too short for τὰ μεγάλα διώκειν = τὰ μακρὰ παπταίνειν (Pindar). For this interpretation of βραχύς in Pindar I also note Bacchylides 3.72-6, where βραχ[ὺς surely refers to the short life span of the ἐφαμέριοι. There is

'To think beyond the boundaries of mortality' is described by the chorus as pursuing great things (μεγάλα διώκειν, 397-99: ἐπὶ τούτῳ/δὲ τίς ἂν μεγάλα διώκων/τὰ παρόντ' οὐχι φέροι;). (For the punctuation, cf. Dodds). Dionysiac wisdom, on the other hand, which is based on the idea that we only have a short time to live, chooses the pleasure of the moment, τὰ παρόντα φέρειν, in preference to the unattainable.[269] In the rest of this chorus the adherents of these two attitudes to life, that of τὰ μεγάλα διώκειν as against that of τὰ παρόντα φέρειν, are qualified in more detail. Those of the first are μαινόμενοι (raging, 400), κακόβουλοι (men of evil counsel, 401) and περισσοί (presumptuous, 429); those of the second direct their attention towards εὐαίωνα διαζῆν (a life of happiness, 426) and to the norms and behaviour of the common people (430-32). Just as their attitude to life is called σοφία, so they are called σοφοί, because they do not let their minds be contaminated by the περισσοί (428-29).[270] Summing it up, the chorus produce the following contrasts in their hymn of praise to Dionysus' euphrosyne:

ἀχάλινα στόματα	ἡσυχίας βίοτος
ἄνομος ἀφροσύνη	τὸ φρονεῖν
τὸ σοφόν	σοφία
τὸ μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν	(τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν)
μεγάλα διώκειν	τὰ παρόντα φέρειν
μαινόμενοι	εὐαίωνα διαζῆν
περισσοί	σοφοί
κακόβουλοι	τὸ πλῆθος ὅ τι τὸ φαυλότερον ἐνόμισε χρῆταί τε δέχεσθαι

Δυστυχία, ill fortune, is predicted as the outcome for the followers of the first set; those of the second see their wisdom repaid with τέρψις ἄλυπος (joy without grief, 423), an idea that is put into words several times later in the play, when the chorus call the life of such wise people 'blessed', in

a remarkable correspondence here, in that Bacchylides continues with: πτερόεσσα δ' ἐλπίς, which Pindar appears to be copying with his πτερόεις Πάγασος.

[269] J. Roux (ad 399) gives a great number of references for this topic. The chorus in the *Bacchae* harps on the theme: 424-31, 910-11.

[270] 427-28: σοφὰν δ' ἀπέχειν πραπίδα φρένα τε ⏑–⏖–̽⏖⏑⏑⏖ cho dim B
περισσῶν παρὰ φωτῶν. ⏑––⏑⏑–– pher

σοφάν is here used not in an unfavourable (Willink II 224), but in a favourable sense: 'in true wisdom' (so too Dodds, *pace* Willink). 427 is not corrupt, as Dodds believes (he accepts Dindorf's σοφὰ), since the colon is not an iambic dimeter, but a choriambic dimeter B with inversion; before the choriambus we find not –×–×, but ×––×, which occurs very rarely (Miss Dale LM 153 under (b), Soph. *Ant.* 1145 ~ 1152). This inversion appears also in 410 ~ 425: Πιερία μούσειος ἕδρα corresponds to κατὰ φάος νύκτας τε φίλας, scansion: ⏒⏖–̽–⏑⏑–. 412: ἐκεισ' ἄγε με, Βρόμιε Βρόμιε corresponds to 427-scansion: ⏑–⏖⏑̱⏖⏑⏑⏖. The full resolution of the choriambus in 412, which obscures the structure, is probably risked by Euripides because of the chorus' emotion.

their pronouncement of a makarismos (910-11), and when they repeat the thought in 1004: βροτείως ἔχειν ἄλυπος βίος (to behave as a mortal means a life free of grief).

The attitude to life which the chorus portray in the first stasimon, and whose perspective is experienced by the chorus as 'Dionysiac', therefore displays two opposing traits, one of realism and one of escapism. On the one hand this attitude to life accepts everyday reality (τὰ παρόντα φέρει), and tries to live from day to day in this way without sorrow; on the other it tries to evade sorrow through seeking escape in wine (378-85) and in utopian ideas of an earthly paradise (402-16). Both traits are united in the ideal of ὁ τᾶς ἡσυχίας βίοτος (the peaceful life, 389). The description of that ideal given by the chorus in 390-401 looks almost like a Euripidean reminiscence of a Pindaric Ode, *I.* 7.39 ff.:[271]

ἀείσομαι χαίταν στεφάνοισι ἁρμόζων. ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ
  θρασσέτω φθόνος,
ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων
ἕκαλος ἔπειμι γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον
αἰῶνα. θνᾴσκομεν γὰρ ὁμῶς ἅπαντες·
δαίμων δ' ἄισος· τὰ μακρὰ δ' εἴ τις
παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν ἕδραν· ὅ τοι
  πτερόεις ἔρριψε Πάγασος
δεσπόταν ἐθέλοντ' ἐς οὐρανοῦ σταθμοὺς
ἐλθεῖν μεθ' ὁμάγυριν Βελλεροφόνταν
Ζηνός· τὸ δὲ παρ' δίκαν
γλυκὺ πικροτάτα μένει τελευτά.

(I will sing, putting garlands on my hair. May the jealousy of the Immortals not trouble this, that, pursuing each day's pleasure, I shall peacefully come to old age and to my fated days. For all alike we die; only our fate is different. But if a man fixes his eyes on the things far off, he is too small to reach the bronze-floored abode of the gods. So winged Pegasus threw off his master Bellerophon, when he wanted to come to the heavenly dwellings, to the company of Zeus. A most bitter end lies in store for what is sweet beyond justice.)

---

[271] For ἕκαλος ἔπειμι κτλ. I follow the non-biographical interpretation, cf. David C. Young, *Pindar Isthmian 7, Myth and Exempla* (Leiden 1971) 26ff. See too Hermann Fraenkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (²München 1962) 543 n. 12. V. di Benedetto *Euripide: teatro e società* (Turin 1971), 278ff., 291, also comments on the parallels between the *Bacchae* and Pi.*I.* 7.

This correspondence between the first stasimon of the *Bacchae* with Pindar's ode, and with other texts in Greek literature,[272] indicates that one referential aspect of meaning (the reference to the ideal of ἀπραγμοσύνη, the escapism of war-weary Athenians of this period), is indeed, as Dodds points out (ad 389-92), a secondary theme of this chorus. But it is worth noting that Euripides, in giving this picture of an attitude to life which clings to quietness, associates its escapism with Dionysus; it is this god, with his domains of wine, love and freedom (378-85, 402-16), who makes the chorus seek an escape from reality; it is by virtue of this god's prerogatives that this escapism is considered to be Dionysiac.

The chorus also link popular sentiment to Dionysiac σοφία: τὸ πλῆθος ὅ τι τὸ φαυλότερον ἐνόμισε χρῆταί τε (what the common people think and do). These are the last words of their song, and in this position they have perhaps a stronger dramatic relevance than those which preceded them, since directly after these words there follows the entry of a representative of the πλῆθος τὸ φαυλότερον ('common people'), the soldier leading the arrested stranger (434 ff), who gives an indication that he, in contrast to the king, does indeed consider the recent events in Thebes as a manifestation of a divine presence (441 f., 449 f.). This popular sentiment has its opposite in the thoughts of περισσοὶ φῶτες (presumptuous people, 429); and they, unlike the common people, are looked upon with hatred by Dionysus.[273] That it is indeed Dionysus whose jealousy (φθόνος) is aroused, lies naturally at the descriptive level in line with the dramatic facts of the *Bacchae*. Pindar's general ἀθανάτων φθόνος (jealousy of the gods) (*I.* 7.39) is implicitly present in *Bacchae* 392-93; it is Euripides' specific application of this jealousy to Dionysus which provides an essential complement at the referential level to the picture of Dionysiac euphrosyne in this play.

The orgiastic god

The significance to mortals of the god Dionysus, as portrayed by the chorus in the first stasimon, therefore has its roots in the ethic of 'sympotic' euphrosyne: δίκαια φρονεῖν (right thinking), and in the desire for the life of quietness: ἡσυχίας βίοτος. The audience are confronted with another aspect of the god in those parts of the play in which their attention is directed to the orgiastic nature of Dionysus. This occurs principally in the parodos.

---

[272] Cf. di Benedetto l.l. (n. 271). He comments (p. 278) that Euripides in the *Bacchae* takes up old themes that are not especially Dionysiac. It is however remarkable that Pindar dedicates this ode to the Theban Strepsiades, and in its opening lines mentions the god Dionysus among the καλὰ ἐπιχώρια of Thebes.

[273] χαίρει (418)—φιλεῖ (419)—μισεῖ (424).

Did Dionysus, as an orgiastic god, have as clear a referential meaning for the audience of the Bacchae as he did as god of wine, of euphrosyne, and of the Anthesteria? The question can only be inadequately answered, since we are not well informed about the orgiastic side of Dionysus, and above all, because our most important source document is the *Bacchae* itself. In spite of this we can assume with fair certainty that the orgiastic Dionysus was not so integral a part of Athenian life as the wine god. Maenadism in Attica is either mythical—as such it is a favourite subject for vase-painters—or it was restrained within a fairly tightly regulated cult, either public: the Thyiades, or private: for example the Iobacchia.[274] Ritual elements of the ὄργια (mysteries) like sparagmos and omophagia such as occur in the parodos of the *Bacchae*, were part of the reality of the myth, not of the cult.[275] In the *Bacchae* Euripides brings to life the ritual acts which accompany the ὀρειβασία (mountain dancing). He does not do so in the parodos, where the chorus describe maenadism; there the ritual acts, the snake-handling (102-04), the ritual dress (105-14), sparagmos and omophagia, are merged with mythical representations into one whole: Cybele, Corybants and Satyrs (126-34), miraculous manifestations (143), and the presence of the god himself (144-52).[276] It is in the action of the play that the Theban women actually perform what we have learnt to recognize from the parodos as the rites of ὀρειβασία: they really handle snakes (698, 767-68), suckle fawns and wolf-cubs (699-700), produce rich streams of water, wine, milk and honey (704-11), tear living cattle to pieces (735-47), and carry off children from Hysiae and Erythrae for the practice of omophagia in its most barbaric form (754). Only *these* women are not maenads in the sense that the chorus give to those who are initiated into the god's service, 72-82. The Theban women have not been initiated, but perform the ritual acts because of a psychic compulsion laid upon them from outside by the god (32-40).

We do not know the precise meaning which the Dionysiac ὄργια, and particularly sparagmos and omophagia, had for antiquity. It is likely that the connection with Dionysus lies somewhere in his function of being a god of vegetation. But whether tearing animals to pieces and eating

---

[274] Deubner, *Attische Feste* 147ff., Nilsson, GGR I. 574.

[275] The Milesian inscription (Th. Wiegand *Ausgrabungen Milet* (Abh. Ak. Berlin) VI (1908) 22) which speaks of ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν (cf. Dodds *Introd.* xvi n. 4), naturally refers to the cult, but the omophagia is restrained, and has no resemblance to the 'wild' omophagia in the mountains described by the chorus in the *Bacchae*. Cf. A. Henrichs, *Die Maenaden von Milet* ZPE 4 (1969) 223-41, H. S. Versnel, Lampas 9 (1976) 24f.

[276] The parodos is discussed in chapter 8 (pp. 134f.). For the epode see too Appendix 4.

them raw was a sacramental feast in which the god was torn to pieces and eaten, is far from certain and may at best be considered as a highly speculative explanation of the ritual.[277] The question, however, of whether Euripides, in his description of the Dionysiac rituals in the *Bacchae*, is referring to the Eleusinian mysteries, can only be answered in the negative.[278] In examining the *Bacchae's* aspects of meaning the religious function of ὄργια is not perhaps an essential element. Euripides fixes the spectator's attention on the dramatic function which ὄργια have in the action. This function is plain: as far as Thebes is concerned the ὄργια are a weapon in the hands of the god, by which he can impose his punitive will on Thebes, for the city has no part in the makarismos uttered by the chorus on the initiated: neither the women, nor Pentheus, nor Cadmus, although the women, *and* Pentheus, *and* Cadmus all take part in the ritual acts of the orgiastic cult of Dionysus.

---

[277] But see J. P. Guépin *The Tragic Paradox* 17f., 31ff.

[278] As is well known, the relationship between Dionysus-Iacchos and the gods of the Eleusinion is obscure, and the subject of a lively discussion (cf. H. S. Versnel, Lampas 9 (1976) 30). But whatever this relationship may have been for the Athenians at the end of the 5th century, there is no doubt that Euripides in the *Bacchae* does not in any way link the mysteries at Eleusis with the rites of Dionysus: (i) as Dodds commented ad 72-75, the chorus base the promise of happiness on a religious experience, but their promise 'is for this world, not for the next—the happiness which Dionysus gives is here and now'. Any indication of a 'Jenseits' is consistently lacking in the *Bacchae's* choruses, whereas this 'Jenseits' is central to the religious experience of the mysteries of Eleusis (Nilsson GGR I 477). The fact that the chorus' makarismos (72-77) goes clothed in the language of the mysteries, has therefore the dramatic function of invoking for the Athenian public the sacramental mood in which this cult hymn to Dionysus is sung (cf. A. J. Festugière, Eranos 54 (1956) 72-87), but no more than that. (ii) The rites which in the *Bacchae* the women celebrate on Cithaeron (680-768, 1048-1152) are admittedly pseudo-rituals, imposed upon them by the god under duress, but they are essential for the rites of the orgiastic Dionysus (particularly the sparagmos and the omophagia). The worshipper of Dionysus who tears his living prey to pieces, and eats its flesh raw, is not his normal self and can only achieve such violence within the community of the thiasos. The god immediately responds to these actions by his epiphany (see p. 135). The ὄργια are then no rites of initiation, but recurring rituals, whose collective ecstasy and violent character are in sharp contrast to the epopteia of the initiates, for whom it is a question not of doing, but of seeing (Nilsson GGR I 661), not of ecstasy, but of a deeply private and tender religious emotion (Nilsson l.l. 654).—To recapitulate: Dionysiac ecstasy and Eleusinian piety were perhaps already comparable states of mind in the conceptual world of the fifth century, when one takes into account Ar. *Ra.* 316ff. The torch ceremonial during the Lenaea, in which Iacchos played a part (Σ Ar. *Ra.* 479), and the torchlight procession of the Attic thyiades on Parnassus (Paus. x.4.3.) in the state-regulated cult of Dionysus, had perhaps more in common than we can now trace (cf. Pickard-Cambridge DFA^2 35). But in the *Bacchae* Euripides, perhaps deliberately, only allows those aspects of the Dionysus cult to be presented that are in no way related to Eleusis, both in the 'paradise now' theme that is dominant in the parodos and in the first two stasima, and in the orgiastic acts leading to death and destruction that determine the events on Cithaeron and the triumph of the chorus in the last part of the play.

The god of wisdom and of madness

When we look at the significance of the god Dionysus in the *Bacchae*, we can establish that Euripides does justice in his tragedy to the split personality of the god, but that he has given dramatic form to the god's different attributes in different ways. The god of wine and of euphrosyne, the god who by his gifts makes men forget their sorrow and shows them the way to sensual pleasure, appears in the play in a way that is mainly referential and conceptual. References are made to these concepts of the god by Teiresias (278-85), the chorus (370-433, 902-11), the stranger (651), and by the herdsman from Cithaeron (769-74). But on the descriptive and participational levels of meaning this god has a relatively modest role, at least in the dramatic conflict between the god and Thebes. Pentheus is not against wine and other pleasures of the senses; he only follows his mother and her sisters in thinking that the Dionysus who was born to Semele was not a god, but the fruit of a slip by Semele, which put her in the bed of an ordinary mortal (28). The child Dionysus who was born as a result of this alliance perished in the flames of Zeus' lightning (244-45). And Pentheus is persecuting a prophet from foreign parts, who on the pretext of propaganda for a non-existent god, gives rein to his own lusts (237-38, 242-43). Yet, out of the referential aspect of meaning of Dionysus as god of euphrosyne, patron of εὐαίωνα διαζῆν, Euripides has constructed a dramatic contrast. This contrast lies in the opposition explained above between cleverness (τὸ σοφόν) and (Dionysiac) wisdom (σοφία) in the first stasimon. The chorus unmistakebly have Pentheus in mind when they speak of men of evil counsel, of madmen, and of presumptuous people (κακόβουλοι, μαινόμενοι and περισσοί) who value cleverness (τὸ σοφόν) and pursuing great things (τὰ μεγάλα διώκειν) higher than wisdom (σοφία) and bearing with what is at hand (τὰ παρόντα φέρειν). Teiresias anticipated the chorus in this verdict on Pentheus, a verdict which is unjust since Pentheus' reasoning, and his reaction to the stranger's arrival from Lydia, gave the lie to such an opinion. Pentheus' reasoning has been described previously (p. 41) as the reasoning of common sense: it consists of a blunt rejection of Dionysus' divinity, no chopping logic with the gods (ἐνσοφίζεσθαι τοῖσι δαίμοσιν 200). In addition the suspicions and threatening attitude adopted by Pentheus towards the stranger, even when he has only heard him referred to (233 ff.), may give an impression of recklessness, but not of the evil counsel (κακοβουλία) which the chorus means when it attacks the exaggerations of all too intellectual superiority (περισσῶν παρὰ φωτῶν 429). By this dramatic contrast the poet therefore produces a contradiction in the plot. The audience observe this contradiction occurring equally both in Pentheus'

behaviour and in the reaction to it by Teiresias and by the chorus; it will be more closely studied in the relationship of the chorus to the action (chapter 10), and will also be considered in the context of Euripides' conceptions about his play.

Unlike the god of wine and euphrosyne, the Dionysus of the ecstatic rites is continually and dominatingly present in the action on the descriptive level: at the decisive points it is the god who gives direction to the plot. These points are: the opening situation of the play, in which the god has driven the Theban women mad, and chased them out onto Cithaeron (32-38); the palace miracles, in which the god liberates the stranger and his thiasos from the power of their oppressor (576-637);[279] the murderous rituals which the god makes the women perform in their delusions, through which Pentheus is provoked into seeking an immediate solution to the conflict (734-68); Pentheus' delusions (811 ff.) and Pentheus' sparagmos (1076 ff.) At all these points the most important weapon in the god's hands is that of driving his adversary mad. At the participational level of meaning it is the effect of the god's mania on his opponents in the play which has the strongest influence on the audience's emotions during the performance, in so far as these emotions consist of pity and fear, φόβος and ἔλεος. Naturally this mania also plays a role in the referential and conceptual aspects of meaning; within the play Teiresias had even pointed out explicitly the connection between the bacchic and the manic (τὸ βακχεύσιμον and τὸ μανιῶδες 298-99) and had recognized μανία as one of the god's weapons (305). There is therefore a second complex of ideas to that of τὸ σοφόν and σοφία that will later demand attention at the conceptual level of the *Bacchae's* meaning; that of μαίνεσθαι and μανία.

---

[279] In 636 Dodds' emendation ἐκ βακχίων seems to me correct.

CHAPTER SEVEN

DIONYSUS (2): THE GOD ON THE TRAGIC STAGE

The previous chapter enquired into the common assumptions about the god Dionysus, held by the poet and his public in their ordinary life, and into how the poet related to these references in his play. This chapter enquires into what the public might have expected of a god who appeared on the Attic tragic stage.[280] The appearance of gods on the stage was a theatrical convention. Two factors in it deserve attention, first, how Euripides handles this convention in his work and in the *Bacchae*, in the light of the history of this tragic stage convention in general, and secondly, what can be recovered about the relationship between this convention in the plot of the *Bacchae*, and the appearance of Dionysus in the predecessors to this play in Greek literature.

Gods on the stage before Euripides

A god who personally interferes in the actions of mortals, through his visible appearance, was a familiar image for Greeks since Homer. Two kinds of epiphany are regularly found in epic: in these the appearance of the god can be overt, e.g. where Athena is immediately recognised by Achilles in the middle of his quarrel with Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.194), or hidden, as when Apollo misleads Achilles Ἀγήνορι πάντα ἐοικώς (being just like Agenor, *Il.* 21.600). A god's appearance can also take place while the observer sleeps: *Il.* 2.5, *Od.* 6.49. F. Pfister[281] categorises all these appearances as *epic epiphanies*. The criterion of an epic epiphany is personal interference by a god in the actions of mortals in order to direct them in a way desired by the god. Pfister distinguishes the epic epiphany from the *mythical epiphany*, in which the epiphany is an essential part of the myth

---

[280] In this connection satyr plays are excluded, although gods do appear on the stage in the action of this type of play (Aeschylus *Isthmiastae*, Sophocles *Inachus, Ichneutai*). But tragedy is, by Aristotle's definition, a μίμησις πράξεως σπουδαίας (*Poet.* 1449b 24); it is plain that the action of the gods in a type of play that does not conform to his prescribed definition has its own specific character and a different meaning for the audience. Whatever may have been the original relationship between tragedy and a chorus of satyrs, the classical satyr play, as it possibly originated from Pratinas (TrGF 4 T 1: Suda π 2230 πρῶτος ἔγραψε Σατύρους), is an independent type of drama, in which the action of the gods displays burlesque elements. Moreover, the context is quite different. The proper protagonist of the satyr play, Silenus with his satyrs, already constitutes a supernatural appearance. The same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to comedy.

[281] *Epiphanie*, RE Suppl. IV (1924) 277-323.

about the god in question, particularly of Demeter and Dionysus. Pfister further distinguishes the 'Märchen-Epiphanie' and the 'legendarische Epiphanie'; from another point of view E. Pax[282] distinghuishes, besides the epic and mythical epiphanies, a *cult epiphany* and a *soteriological epiphany*. In this enquiry into the god Dionysus on the Attic tragic stage, and of his epiphanic actions in the *Bacchae* (which will be discussed in chapter 8), Pax's classification is preferred,[283] distinguishing on the one hand the god's epic and mythical epiphanies, and on the other his cult and soteriological ones. These last two occur in those passages where Euripides refers to rituals and prayers, by means of which the god is invoked to appear, either to attend the worship offered him by his followers or to save them from their enemies.

The epic epiphany of the old epics had yet another attribute that is illuminating for the study of the appearance of gods on the stage: the appearance of the god has a naturalness, which is not present in later periods.[284] In the mythic material from which by preference the tragedians drew the subject matter of their plays, the epic epiphany acts as a means of communication, anchored on the myth, between gods and men. When the tragedians came to stage these myths in the sixth century, they had to answer the question of whether, and if so how, they would handle the epic epiphany. We must remember here that the transition from narrated events (the bardic recital) to acted events was a gradual process, and that narrative always played a fairly major part in the drama. On the

---

[282] *Epiphanie*, RAC 5 (1961) 832-909.

[283] The four definitions of epiphanies do not exclude each other. This is particularly the case with the epic and the mythical epiphanies, where the difference is above all in the method of approach: in epic epiphany the concentration is upon the people (in the epic) to whom the gods appear; in the mythical epiphany it is primarily on the god (from the myth) who appears to men. However, I prefer not to introduce new terminology, since Pax's four definitions listed seem to me valid for this study. The cult epiphany has a clearly different character from the epic or mythical epiphanies, since there the god's presence is a direct result of the religious exercises of a *group*, i.e. the thiasos, and not the result of spontaneous contact between god and man. Pax writes (840f.) about the cult epiphany: 'Hierbei erfährt der Epiphaniebegriff eine Erweiterung, indem er auf Fälle übertragen wird, die in regelmässigen Abständen sich wiederholen, denen somit das Überraschungsmoment fehlt. Dieses wird ersetzt durch die ausschmückenden Epiphaniemotive. Zur Vorbereitung auf die Feste dienen die nach festen Schema aufgebauten Ruf- und Heischelieder (ὕμνοι κλητικοί), in denen die Gottheit direkt angeredet wird (ἔρχου, ἴθι, φάνηθι, προφάνηθι)'. Dionysus' cult and soteriological epiphanies are examined further in chapter 8, p. 134ff.

[284] This quality of naturalness is a survival from the time that gods and men were not yet separate, cf. Hes. *Th.* 535 and *Fr.* 1.6-7 M.-W.: ξυναὶ γὰρ τότε δαῖτες ἔσαν, ξυνοὶ δὲ θόωκοι / ἀθανάτοις τε θεοῖσι καταθνήτοις τ' ἀνθρώποις. In the *Odyssey* too this naturalness is no longer always present; *Od.* 17.483: 'Αντίνο', οὐ μὲν κάλ' ἔβαλες δύστηνον ἀλήτην, / οὐλόμεν', εἰ δή πού τις ἐπουράνιος θεός ἐστι, is followed by the warning that the gods are abroad upon earth ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφορῶντες. *Od.* 16, 161: Athene's invisibility to Telemachus is not only stated, but explained: οὐ γάρ πως πάντεσσι θεοὶ φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς.

one hand the tragic chorus with its strophic structure is in general in the tradition of non-dramatic choral lyrics which have a (triadic) strophic structure; as a consequence of the narrative features of choral lyrics, the tragic chorus also has the function, among other things, of telling the story of the myth;[285] on the other hand the introduction of an actor means a widening of the possibilities for narrative expression by the dramatic poet. It is true that we can no longer determine whether the role of the one actor—before Aeschylus introduced a second—was that of a dramatis persona or of a narrator/explainer who tells the story of the events from an observer's point of view;[286] but in that part of tragedy that has survived, the informative rhesis—particularly the messenger speech—is the principal type of dramatic speech.[287]

With the introduction of a second actor we are in any case dealing with dramatis personae. Gods appear as participants in the action together with men, and on the stage. This is in fact epic epiphany. In Aeschylus the naturalness of epic epiphany is still present in its entirety: *Eum.* 566 ff. Apollo, Athena, and the Furies go to law with Orestes and the judges; they are all on the same level in the play.[288] At the same time Aeschylean theatre recognized scenes in which only gods appeared, which can be considered the counterpart of those scenes in epic which were played exclusively by gods, on Olympus or elsewhere. Such a scene was shown in *Psychostasia* where Zeus appeared sitting in judgement, with Thetis and Eos beside him.[289] It was certainly not played in the presence of mortals on the stage, so that it cannot be called an epic epiphany. A comparable play is *Prometheus*; if the play which has come down to us is not by Aeschylus, but by a tragedian who deliberately aimed at an Aeschylean imitation in his play, it too is perhaps an appropriate example of the category of 'drama of the gods'.[290]

---

[285] Jürgen Rode in W. Jens, ed., *Bauformen* 97ff.

[286] Cf. Pickard-Cambridge-Webster, *Dithyramb*^{2} 90ff. The introduction by Thespis of an ὑποκριτής as a commentator on the chorus was certainly the decisive point in the development of dramatic art, if this introduction took place at the same time as Thespis' invention of painting his face, and later of using masks, though we do not know what the original function was of the face-painting.

[287] Cf. Brigitte Mannsperger in W. Jens, ed., *Bauformen* 150ff.; J. M. Bremer, *Why Messenger-Speeches?* 43.

[288] Pickard-Cambridge, *Theatre of Dionysus* 43.

[289] Plut. *De aud. poet.* 17a: οἷον ἐπὶ τοῦ Διὸς εἰρηκότος Ὁμήρου "ἐν δ' ἐτίθει κτλ. (*Il.* 22, 209-13)" τραγῳδίαν ὁ Αἰσχύλος ὅλην τῷ μύθῳ περιέθηκεν (TGF p. 88 N^2). Oliver Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford 1977), 431-33, expresses scepticism about the likelihood of Zeus appearing as a dramatis persona.

[290] Cf. Mark Griffith, *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge 1977) 250ff. and Oliver Taplin, op. cit. 240-75, 460-69.

The appearance in the *Bacchae* of Dionysus in mortal form gives us a special interest in epic epiphany in the Aeschylean theatre wherever gods appear in similar form. In the *Semele*, Hera enters disguised as a mendicant priestess; as in the *Bacchae*, the disguise seems to be intended to mislead a mortal adversary, although this mortal (Semele?) appears to be overtly warned that Hera is present in mortal form.[291] About the *Edoni* the scholiast says Ar. *Th.* 135 (Fr. 61 N², 72 M): λέγει δὲ (sc. ὁ Λυκοῦργος) ἐν τοῖς Ἠδωνοῖς πρὸς τὸν συλληφθέντα Διόνυσον· ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις: '[Lycurgus] says to Dionysus who has been captured: where is this effeminate person from?' K. Deichgräber[292] maintains that in this case Dionysus appeared as a god, and not in mortal form, but we have no certainty on this point.

From the Aeschylean plays mentioned it is plain that in his theatre gods appeared to men on the stage in epic epiphany. But in later tragedy we see that this means of communication between gods and men is no longer used, and that visible appearances of gods have been reduced to the prologue and to the end of the exodos; the gods are no longer actors, their appearances are no longer within the complications of the plot, and the naturalness of epic epiphany is no longer tolerated. We must perhaps look in Aeschylus for the beginning of this development in tragic dramaturgy. In his Φρύγες ἢ Ἕκτορος λύτρα (Phrygians, or Hector's ransom) Hermes appeared; the Vita says about Achilles (6, TGF p. 50): οὐ φθέγγεται, πλὴν ἐν ἀρχαῖς ὀλίγα πρὸς Ἑρμῆν ἀμοιβαῖα (he does not speak, except in the beginning a few exchanges with Hermes). It is possible that Hermes only appeared in this play in the prologue to explain the god's will to Achilles, and that the action proper ran its course with mortal antagonists only.[293] In any case we find this happening in Sophocles' *Ajax*: Athena speaks to Odysseus and Ajax in the prologue, but she is not present in the course of the action itself. We have here an intermediate stage, in which the divinity still has visible personal contact in the prologue with those men towards whom divine interest is specially directed, but is thereafter no longer manifest in person to the mortal actors. After *Ajax* Sophocles (following Euripides' example?) appears to have imposed still stricter limits on epiphanies; in the surviving plays the only other divine appearance is of Heracles in the *Philoctetes* as deus ex machina.

---

[291] *Fr.* 356 M (P. Oxy. 2249 17f.):
]Ἥρα κατει[κ]α[σθεῖσα τῶν θνητῶν τινι
]ἥκει.
I follow Mette in assigning F 356 to the same play as F 355, and I agree with him that K. Latte *Philol.* 97 (1948) 52 rightly gave F 355 to the *Semele.*

[292] *Die Lykurgie des Aischylos*, Nachr. Göttingen 3, 8 (1939) 307.

[293] This is, of course, not certain: (i) ἐν ἀρχαῖς need not point only to the prologue; (ii) Hermes may also have appeared later in the action.

Gods on the Euripidean stage

The limitations which Euripides imposes on epiphanies in his theatre, confine divine appearances almost entirely to the prologue and—in the role of deus ex machina—to the exodos.[294] The gods who have spoken the prologue, with the exception of Dionysus in the *Bacchae*, do not appear again in the action. Moreover their appearances are not proper epiphanies, because they have already left the stage before the mortals

[294] Gods in Euripides' tragedies (the brackets () stand for 'probable appearance, but not known of which god'):

play	*prologue*	*action*	*deus ex machina*
Protesilaus		Hermes?	
Alcestis	Apollo, Thanatos		
Hippolytus I			Poseidon? Artemis? Aphrodite?
Hippolytus II	Aphrodite		Artemis
Cretes	Aphrodite?		
Alcmene	Hermes?		Zeus?
Alope			Poseidon?
Danae			()
Skyrioi	Thetis		
Ino			()
Bellerophon			Hermes?
Chrysippus			()
Andromache			Thetis
Hiketides			Athena
Erechtheus			Athena
Phrixus B		Dionysus?	
Electra			Dioscuri
Melanippe Desm.			Poseidon
Alexandros	Aphrodite		Apollo
Palamedes			()
Troades	Poseidon, Athena		
Antigone			Dionysus
Iphigeneia T.			Athena
Heracles		Iris, Lyssa	
Andromeda			Athena? Aphrodite?
Helena			Dioscuri
Ion	Hermes		Athena
Antiope	Dionysus?		Hermes
Hypsipyle			Dionysus
Phaethon	Aphrodite?		()
Meleager	Artemis?		Athena?
Auge	()		
Oedipus	()		
Orestes			Apollo
Archelaos			Apollo
Alcmaeon at Corinth	Apollo		Apollo
Bacchae	Dionysus	Dionysus	Dionysus
Iphigeneia at Aulis			Artemis

taking part in the action appear.[295] In contrast the deus ex machina in the exodos does appear in epiphany to mortal characters in the play, either ἐκ μηχανῆς (ex machina) or ἀπὸ τοῦ θεολογείου (from the theologion). This epiphany can still be an interference by the god in human affairs (as in Soph. *Ph.*; *Orestes*), but this interference is always a conclusion to the action, and by it the course of the play is brought to its due end. Often the thrust of the epiphany really lies outside the course of the action, for instance where the god justifies himself (*Ion*) or interprets the future (*Andr.*, *Bacchae*).[296]

In the *Alcestis* Apollo was a god who was very close to the mortals in Admetus' house in the period that preceded the action of the play; later Thanatos appears as an actor, entering the house in his turn. It is a half-satyrical moment; Thanatos with his sword is introduced onto the stage (76 τόδ' ἔγχος), but the sequel, a scene between Thanatos and Alcestis, is missing.[297] In the *Protesilaus*, as in the *Alcestis*, there is a return from the kingdom of death; Hermes may have appeared on stage as ψυχοπομπός (guide of souls) during the action.

The *Alcestis* dates from 438, the *Protesilaus* is still earlier.[298] In his later work Euripides bans gods from the action proper; whenever they appear, their appearance is a supernatural event, in no way self-evident. So in the *Heracles* Iris and Lyssa appear above the palace with the help of a crane in the stage machinery. Euripides has here deliberately tried for a theatrical effect which is in no way related to the naturalness of epic epiphany. Dodds calls Lyssa in the *Heracles* (Introd. *Bacchae* xxxi) 'a purely symbolic figure'. Still, the *Heracles* is exceptional; Athena also appears, although in a messenger speech, and not actually on the stage.[299] But this visible ap-

---

[295] Divine involvement in the action like that of Aphrodite in the action of the *Hippolytus* is not the subject of this enquiry. The *Hecuba* is an example of effective dramatic composition with a supernatural speaker for the prologue: Polydorus' shade speaks the prologue, and his corpse washes up on the beach during the action.

[296] It is possible that the naturalness of the epic epiphany was a continuing feature of the tragic stage apart from Euripides. The only indication of this is the bizarre passage in *Rhesus* 595-673, where Athena appears during the action, first to Odysseus and Diomedes, then in disguise as Aphrodite to Paris, then again as Athena herself to the Greeks. The play cannot possibly be by Euripides on metrical grounds alone.

[297] We do not know whether there was such a scene in Phrynichus *Alcestis*, cf. TrGF F 3, Serv. ad Verg. *A.* 4.694: 'alii dicunt Euripidem Orcum in scaenam inducere, gladium ferentem quo crinem Alcesti abscidat, et Euripidem hoc a Phrynicho, antiquo tragico, mutuatum'. On the question of whether Phrynichus' play was a satyr play, see A. M. Dale, *Eur. Alc.*, *Introd.* xiiff.

[298] Von Wilamowitz, *Kleine Schriften* V, 1, 524: *Alc.* 348 includes a reminiscence of this play. F. Jouan, *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens* (Paris 1966) 334 thinks the *Alcestis* came first.

[299] 1002: ἀλλ' ἦλθεν εἰκών, ὡς ὁρᾶν ἐφαίνετο.

pearance to the people inside the house is also an epiphanic event in the action.

We may perhaps allow for an appearance of Dionysus on the stage during the action of *Phrixus* B. The hypothesis of the play reads: (P. Oxy. (27) 2455 fr. 17, 281 ff.):[300]

> ἡ δὲ (sc. Ἰνώ) τον Διόν[υσον] ἐπικαλέ[σασ]α ἐναρ[γῆ
> θάνατον διώλισθεν· ἐμμανεῖς γὰρ π[οι-
> ήσας [ὁ] Δ[ι]όνυσος Φρίξον τε [κ]αὶ Ἕλλη[ν τ]ὴν
> ἀδε[λ]φ[ὴ]ν προηγάγετο — κτλ.

H. van Looy translates the first sentence: 'she called on Dionysus for help and escaped a tangible death'. Soo too T. B. L. Webster:[301] 'She (Ino) having summoned Dionysus escaped certain death'. A more obvious translation seems to me to be: 'She called for help on Dionysus in his visible shape and escaped death'.[302]

Finally in the *Bacchae* Dionysus not only appears on the stage in a principal role in the action, but the prologue and the part of deus ex machina in the exodos are also assigned to him. In addition, his appearance in the action has two aspects: in his mortal shape, and in the miracles as the god made manifest (576-603, 616-37, 1063-83). This dramatic composition is unique among all surviving plays of Attic tragedy.

We can therefore determine that epic epiphany in tragedy disappears within a period of a half century as an element of dramatic composition in the structure of the action, with the exception of the *Heracles*, which play has almost the air of a 'drama of the gods', involving Hera, Athena, Iris, Lyssa and Heracles himself. A second and most notable exception is the *Bacchae*, a play which from every aspect is one great epiphany of the god Dionysus. Perhaps the presence of the god—in many forms—before men is the key fact about Dionysus, that links the god of Dionysiac ὄργια with the god of wine and of the Anthesteria. If therefore we try to answer the question, what did the audience of the *Bacchae* expect of this god who ap-

---

[300] H. van Looy, *Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides.* Verh. Kon. Vlaamse Acad., Klasse der Letteren 26 (1964) 51 (Brussel 1964) 169ff.

[301] *The Tragedies of Euripides* 132.

[302] (i) ἐναργής: 'visible'. The original meaning: 'clothed in brilliance' (Frisk and Chantraine s.v., cf. *Od.* 16.161, quoted in n. 284) kept its force in later Greek, and is the accepted term to indicate a god in his epiphany. Among the typical attributes given by F. Pfister (*Epiphanie* 314ff.) for the usual portrayal of an epiphany, he lists (paragraph 40) the shine and the brilliance of the god as he appears. (ii) διολισθάνειν (-αίνειν) is originally a metaphor, borrowed from wrestling: 'to slip through the fingers' (van Leeuwen ad Ar. *Nu.* 434). In later Greek, after Polybius (Pape s.v.) the verb is very common and means scarcely more than ἀπο- or διαφεύγειν. When the word is used, as here, in a legal context (Ino's threatened death is in fulfilment of a legal judgement), θάνατον διώλισθεν is as simple an expression as in Plato's *Apology* 39a: ὅπως ἀποφεύξεται πᾶν ποιῶν θάνατον.

peared in the action on the tragic stage, we can make two assumptions. First, as a god who takes part in the action in an epic epiphany, the Dionysus of the *Bacchae*, both from the point of view of the audience and from that of the poet's dramatic composition, was by the end of the fifth century a remarkable and surprising apparition; it is perhaps for this reason that in the prologue it is announced as many as three times that the god has come to Thebes in the shape of a mortal.[303] Secondly, in the *Bacchae* the poet emphasizes in many ways that the Dionysus of myth and of the cult is essentially the god who is present and who is appearing among men. So, besides an element of 'Brechtian' alienation, the rejection of the theatrical convention used elsewhere by Euripides in his treatment of gods on the stage, we see that the poet deliberately uses a 'presentational' god to make the essentials of his plot more clear. Euripides' methods of doing so are discussed in chapter 8.

Epiphanic motifs in myth: the Homeric hymn

The epiphanic motifs in the *Bacchae* are not thought up by the poet, but borrowed from the myth and the cult. Pfister also commented that the mythic epiphany (*l. l.* 282) applied particularly to Demeter and Dionysus. Pre-eminently, the literary source for the mythic epiphanies of these two gods are the Homeric hymns to Demeter[304] and to Dionysus. The hymn

[303] 4, 53, 54. The reason for this repetition is therefore possibly not only that rightly given by Dodds (ad 53-54, cf. above n. 92): 'the necessity of making it quite clear to the audience that the speaker, whom they accept as a god, will be accepted as a man by the people on the stage', but also that the poet is making clear to his public that a god will share in this way in mortal actions. After the verbs in the immediate vicinity of 4 (ἥκω 1, πάρειμι 5) which are typical of the traditional means of expression for the prologue, the audience is warned by ξυνάψω (52) that the intention of this divine announcer is, in contrast to his predecessors in Euripidean drama, to arrange an eyeball to eyeball confrontation with the Thebans.

[304] In the Homeric hymn to Demeter the poet tells how the goddess, γρηὶ παλαιγενέι ἐναλίγκιος (101), enters service in the house of Celeus. One night, while she is busy making Demophon immortal in the fire, she is interrupted by his mother Metanira. She gives instructions to build a shrine at Eleusis, and she appears in her divine form (275f.):

ὣς εἰποῦσα θεὰ μέγεθος καὶ εἶδος ἄμειψε
γῆρας ἀπωσαμένη, περί τ' ἀμφί τε κάλλος ἄητο.

The hymn ends with the inauguration of the mysteries at Eleusis, 473ff. Demeter is, however, a *noli me tangere* for the Attic tragedians, as Von Wilamowitz remarks, *Glaube der Hellenen* 2.98. Her absence in epic epiphany on the Attic stage is striking, although she must have appeared in Sophocles *Triptolemus*, cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant.* 1.12.2: πεποίηται γὰρ αὐτῷ (sc. Σοφοκλεῖ) Δημήτηρ διδάσκουσα τὸν Τριπτόλεμον, ὅσην χώραν ἀναγκασθήσεται σπείρων τοῖς δοθεῖσιν ὑπ' ἀυτῆς καρποῖς διεξελθεῖν ... ἀπόχρη δὲ ταῦτα μόνα λεχθέντα τῶν ἰαμβείων, ἐν οἷς φησί (*Fr.* 541 N^2, 598 P) τὰ δ' ἐξόπισθε χειρὸς ἐς τὰ δεξία, / Οἰνωτρία τε πᾶσα καὶ Τυρρηνικὸς / κόλπος Λιγυστική τε γῆ σε δέξεται'. The timidity with which the Great Goddess was approached in Attica apparently restrained the tragedians from making her appear in their plays as boldly as they did Athena or Apollo. Possibly too the absence of Demeter in the theatre was based on a conscious separation, *in theatralibus,* between Dionysus on the one side, and τὼ θεώ on the other.

to Dionysus (*Hymn. Hom.* 7), which must have been written centuries before the *Bacchae*,[305] is one great manifold epiphany of the god. In the hymn the god's epiphanies, beginning with his appearance as νεηνίῃ ἀνδρὶ ἐοικώς (like a young man) without the poet making any attempt to give a reason for this appearance, are listed one after the other with no internal dramatic unity. The structure of the hymn is compared below with corresponding elements in the *Bacchae*:

Hymn to Dionysus	Eur. *Bacchae*
(i) The appearance of the god and his description, 3-6: (ἐφάνη...)νεηνίῃ ἀνδρὶ ἐοικὼς / πρωθήβῃ· χαλαὶ δὲ περισσείοντο ἔθειραι / κυάνεαι, φᾶρος δὲ περὶ στιβαροῖς ἔχεν ὤμοις /πορφύρεον.	235 ξανθοῖσι βοστρύχοισι εὐοσμῶν κόμην, / οἰνωπά τ' ὄσσοις χάριτας 'Αφροδίτης ἔχων. 353 τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον. 453 ἀτὰρ τὸ μὲν σῶμ' οὐκ ἄμορφος εἶ, ξένε. 455 πλόκαμός τε γὰρ σοῦ ταναός. 493 ἁβρὸν βόστρυχον.
(ii)[a] 6-12: Dionysus is taken captive; the sailors throw him in irons.	226: the Theban bacchae captured by Pentheus, 434 ff.: Dionysus captured.
(ii)[b] 13-14: τὸν δ' οὐκ ἴσχανε δεσμά, λύγοι δ' ἀπὸ τηλόσ' ἔπιπτον / χειρῶν ἠδὲ ποδῶν.	447: αὐτόματα δ' αὐταῖς δεσμὰ διελύθη ποδῶν. 616...με δεσμεύειν δοκῶν / οὔτ' ἔθιγεν οὔθ' ἥψαθ' ἡμῶν, ἐλπίσιν δ' ἐβόσκετο.
(ii)[c] 14-15: ὁ δὲ μειδιάων ἐκάθητο / ὄμμασι κυανέοισι.	438: οὐδ' ὠχρός, οὐδ' ἤλλαξεν οἰνωπὸν γένυν, / γελῶν δὲ καὶ δεῖν κἀπάγειν ἐφίετο. 621 f. πλησίον δ' ἐγὼ παρὼν / ἥσυχος θάσσων ἔλευσσον.
(iii) 15-24: when the helmsman sees the release and the smiles of the prisoner, he warns the others that they have a god on board.	434-50: Pentheus' soldier reacts to the stranger's behaviour and to the release of the women from prison: πολλῶν δ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ θαυμάτων ἥκει πλέως ἐς τάσδε Θήβας· σοὶ δὲ τἄλλα χρὴ μέλειν. 712-13, 769-72 the herdsman's warnings.
(iv)[a] 25-27: the captain tells the helmsman to mind his own business.	248-62, 343-51: brusque treatment by Pentheus of Cadmus and Teiresias, who have been warning him. Pentheus ignores warnings by the soldier (451-52) and the herdsman (778-86).
(iv)[b] 28-31: the captain expects to get a ransom for his prisoner.	511-3: Pentheus considers selling the Lydian bacchants.
(v) 32-44: miracle of epiphany: vine tendrils garland the mast.	576 ff.: miracles of epiphany: earthquake and flash of lightning.

---

[305] The dating of the hymn is disputed. Allen-Sikes ascribe it to the seventh or sixth century; they comment that no other period has a literature so closely related to the hymn that the earlier dating which originated in antiquity must be abandoned. Lesky (*Geschichte der griech. Lit.*² 107) comments, in connection with the hymn to Dionysus: 'Hier besonders spüren wir die Nähe, in der einige dieser Gedichte zur ionischen Kunst der archaischer Zeit stehen'. On the other hand J. Humbert in his edition (p. 170) dates the hymn to the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century.

(vi)[a] 44-45: god made manifest in the form of a lion.	920-22: god made manifest in the form of a bull.
(vi)[b] 45-46: the god makes a bear appear among the sailors.	616-22: under the god's watching eye Pentheus comes up against a bull which he takes for the stranger.
(vii) 50-51: the god kills the captain	1114 ff.: the Theban woman, the instrument of the god, tear Pentheus to pieces.
(viii) 51-53: the sailors jump overboard and are turned into dolphins.	Not available.[306]
(ix) 53-54: κυβερνήτην δ' ἐλεήσας / ἔσχεθε καί μιν ἔθηκε πανόλβιον.	Not available.
(x) 55-57: the god reveals his divine identity and origin.	Dionysus appears in the exodos as deus ex machina; reference to his divine origin (1340 f. cf. P. Ant. 24 *fr.* 2[a] 5-6).

The way in which the god meets his adversaries displays great similarity in the hymn and in the play. However, the plot of the *Bacchae* is much richer when compared with that of the hymn: the god not only acts himself, but also through the Theban women whom he has driven mad; in the dramatic action the chorus have a function, in so far as they are involved in the god's actions, and proclaim his divinity; the warning given to the theomachist ((iii) above) is taken up in the action in several variations: Teiresias, Cadmus, the soldier, the stranger and the herdsman, each one from their own viewpoint and relationship with the king, all utter warnings of approaching calamity. The epiphanic patterns of action of the god himself seem to be the most consistent elements both in the hymn and in the *Bacchae*. These are at the points (i), (ii)b, (ii)c, (v), (vi)a, (vi)b, (vii) and (x). In these epiphanic patterns of the god's action Euripides obviously falls back on the myth; this applies to Dionysus' manifestations as god, as man, in animal form, and in his miracles. Hence the poet has in the action set a series of recognition signals before his public; by his continual references to the epiphanic character of the appearance of the Lydian, who is Dionysus, and by making plain that this epiphanic character does not penetrate to the reality experienced by Pentheus, Euripides prevents the action of the *Bacchae* acquiring for the audience the naturalness of the epic epiphany which we have met in the epic and in Aeschylean drama, and he weaves the epiphanic motifs together with each other to the principium actionis: the continuous oppressive or liberating presence of the god.

---

[306] There is indeed a metamorphosis in the *Bacchae* too, that of Cadmus and Harmonia into snakes (1330-31), and the καί μιν ἔθηκε πανόλβιον of the *Hymn to Dionysus* 54 should be compared with *Bacchae* 1339, where Dionysus promises Cadmus: (Ἄρης) μακάρων τ' ἐς αἶαν σὸν καθιδρύσει βίον. But the different contexts make it unlikely that these two occurrences originate in the same mythical events.

The Dionysus drama in Euripides' predecessors

While we can establish that Euripides has borrowed the epiphanic motifs as such from the myth, it is much harder to establish how far the poet leant on his predecessors in the plot of his play. There is in fact very little known to us, outside the *Bacchae*, of the genre of 'Dionysus drama':[307] on the tragic stage only two characters stand out as displaying opposition to the cult of Dionysus: Lycurgus and Pentheus.

[307] If we classify as Dionysus-dramas those tragedies about the conflict associated with the introduction of his cult, we get the following catalogue, set out in chronological order:

Thespis	Pentheus	s. VI	TrGF 1 T 1. Ex Suda θ 282. Sometimes this play is held to be a 'fabrication' on the grounds of Diog.L. 5.92: (1 T 24) φησὶ δ' Ἀριστόξενος ὁ μουσικὸς καὶ τραγῳδίας αὐτὸν (sc. Heraclidem Ponticum) ποιεῖν καὶ Θέσπιδος αὐτὰς ἐπιγράφειν. But (i) 'even if Heraclides did forge plays in the name of Thespis, he is likely to have followed tradition as regards their titles'. (Pickard-Cambridge-Webster, *Dithyramb*² 85); (ii) an archaeological find suggests that in the sixth century men dressed as maenads, together with flute players, made up a tragic chorus (Webster in *Dithyramb*² 80ff., *List of Monuments* 20).
Polyphrasmon	Lycurgia	s. V	TrGF DID C 4: τρίτος Πολυφράσμων Λυκουργείᾳ τετραλογίᾳ. Performed in 467.
Aeschylus	Lycurgia		Σ Ar. *Th.* 135. Individual titles: *Edoni, Bassarae, Neaniskoi* and *Lycurgus* (Satyr play). Performed after 467? (cf. Deichgräber (1939) 309).
	Bacchae		Ex catalogo. Cf. Stob. *Ecl.* 1.3.26 (*Fr.* 22 N²). Alternative title for the *Pentheus*? Dodds, (*Introd. Ba.* xxix) gives another suggestion: in the catalogue an original Βάκχαι ἢ Βασσάραι may have been changed to Βάκχαι Βασσάραι.
	Semele		Title: Σεμέλη ἢ Ὑδροφόροι.
	Pentheus		
	Xantriae		Satyr play?
	Διονύσου τροφοί		Satyr play.
Sophocles *or* Mesatos	Bacchae		TrGF DID C 6.6 = P. Ox. 2256 *fr.* 3. Performed 461?
Sophocles	Ὑδροφόροι		? Cf. A. *Semele.* Fr. 672-4 P.
Ion Chius	Mega Drama		? TrGF 19 F 15-17.
Xenocles	Bacchae		TrGF DID C 14: πρῶτός γε ἦν Ξενοκλῆς, ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτός ἐστιν, ... Βάκχαις. Performed in 415.
Euripides	Bacchae		Performed in 405.
Iophon	Bacchae		
	Pentheus		Ex Suda ι 451. The title was perhaps Βάκχαι <ἢ> Πενθεύς, cf. Snell ad TrGF 22 T 1.4. Text 22 F 2. Date of performance(s) not known; Iophon won in 435 (first prize) and in

(I) Lycurgus

Polyphrasmon and Aeschylus both wrote a Lycurgus tetralogy; a few fragments of the latter survive, on the basis of which Karl Deichgräber (1939) has ventured a reconstruction. The Lycurgus myth is already known in epic from Homer (Il. 6.130-40) and from Eumelos.[308] Stesichorus too used the myth.[309] In later writers we meet the myth in [Apollodorus] 3.34,[310] Hyginus *Fab.* 132, and in Roman tragedy. In Aeschylus we are best informed about the first play in the tetralogy, the *Edoni.*[311] I draw attention to the following elements from Aeschylus' *Lycurgeia.*

(i) Aeschylus differs from his predecessors who were unanimous that Dionysus fled from Lycurgus and dived into the sea, where he is received

---

			428 (second prize). This play (these plays) could have been performed before and after the *Bacchae.*
Diogenes Athenaeus	Semele	s. IV	TrGF 45 F 1.
Carcinus	Semele		TrGF 70 F 2-3.
Chaeremon	Dionysus		TrGF 71 F 4-7. The play contained the material of the *Bacchae.* (Comm. Arist. Gr. xxi 2.146.18, Anon. *In Arist. Rhet.* 2.23, 1400 b 24.
Cleophon	Bacchae		Ex Suda κ 1730. TrGF 77.
Spintharus	Σεμέλη κεραυνουμένη		Ex Suda σ 945. TrGF 40.
Lycophron	Pentheus	s. III	TrGF 100.

308 Schol. A *Il.* 6.131 (*Fr.* 10 Kinkel): Διόνυσος ὁ Διὸς καὶ Σεμέλης παῖς ἐν Κυβέλοις τῆς Φρυγίας ὑπὸ τῆς Ῥέας τυχὼν καθαρμῶν, καὶ διαθεὶς τὰς τελετάς, καὶ λαβὼν πᾶσαν παρὰ τῆς θεᾶς τὴν διασκευήν, ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἐφέρετο τὴν γῆν, χορειῶν τε καὶ τιμῶν τυγχάνων προηγεῖτο πάντων ἀνθρώπων. παραγενόμενον δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Θρᾴκην Λυκοῦργος ὁ Δρύαντος λυσσήσας (Wil., λυπήσας cod.) Ἥρας μίσει, μύωπι ἀπελαύνει αὐτὸν τῆς γῆς καὶ καθάπτεται αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν τιθηνῶν· ἐτύγχανον γὰρ αὐτῷ συνοργιάζουσαι. θεηλάτῳ δὲ ἐλαυνόμενος μάστιγι τὸν θεὸν ἔσπευδε τιμωρήσασθαι. ὁ δὲ ὑπὸ δέους εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καταδύνει, καὶ ὑπὸ Θέτιδος ὑπολαμβάνεται καὶ Εὐρυνόμης. ὁ οὖν Λυκοῦργος οὐκ ἀμισθὶ δυσσεβήσας ἔδωκε τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δίκην· ἀφῃρέθη γὰρ πρὸς τοῦ Διὸς τὸν ὀφθαλμόν. τῆς ἱστορίας πολλοὶ ἐμνήσθησαν, προηγουμένως δὲ ὁ τὴν Εὐρώπειαν πεποιηκὼς Εὔμηλος.

309 Schol. AB *Il.* 23.92 (234 PMG): Διόνυσος Ἥφαιστον γενόμενον ἐν Νάξῳ μιᾷ τῶν Κυκλάδων ξενίσας, ἔλαβε παρ' αὐτοῦ δῶρον χρύσεον ἀμφορέα. διωχθεὶς δὲ ὕστερον ὑπὸ Λυκούργου καὶ καταφυγὼν εἰς θάλασσαν, φιλοφρόνως αὐτὸν ὑποδεξαμένης Θέτιδος ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ τὸν ἡφαιστότευκτον ἀμφορέα. ἡ δὲ τῷ παιδὶ ἐχάρισατο, ὅπως μετὰ θάνατον ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποτεθῇ τὰ ὀστᾶ. ἱστορεῖ Στησίχορος.

310 Λυκοῦργος δὲ παῖς Δρύαντος, Ἠδωνῶν βασιλεύων, οἳ Στρυμόνα ποταμὸν παροικοῦσι, πρῶτος ὑβρίσας ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν. καὶ Διόνυσος μὲν εἰς θάλασσαν πρὸς Θέτιν τὴν Νηρέως κατέφυγε, Βάκχαι δὲ ἐγένοντο αἰχμάλωτοι καὶ τὸ συνεπόμενον Σατύρων πλῆθος αὐτῷ. αὖθις δὲ αἱ Βάκχαι ἐλύθησαν ἐξαίφνης, Λυκούργῳ δὲ μανίαν ἐνεποίησε Διόνυσος. ὁ δὲ μεμηνὼς Δρύαντα τὸν παῖδα, ἀμπέλου νομίζων κλῆμα κόπτειν, πελέκει πλήξας ἀπέκτεινε, καὶ ἀκρωτηριάσας αὐτὸν ἐσωφρόνησε. τῆς δὲ γῆς ἀκάρπου μενούσης ἔχρησεν ὁ θεὸς καρποφορήσειν αὐτήν, ἂν θανατωθῇ Λυκοῦργος. Ἠδωνοὶ δὲ ἀκούσαντες εἰς τὸ Παγγαῖον αὐτὸν ἀπαγαγόντες ὄρος ἔδησαν, κἀκεῖ κατὰ Διονύσου βούλησιν ὑπὸ ἵππων διαφθαρεὶς ἀπέθανε.

311 Cf. Bruhn, *Einl.* 28f., L. Séchan 63-79, Dodds, *Introd.* xxxif.

by Thetis (and Eurynome). In Aeschylus Dionysus is taken prisoner and interrogated, in which process Lycurgus treats him mockingly, referring to his appearance. Deichgräber is of the opinion that Dionysus does not here appear in the guise of a mortal as in the *Bacchae,* but that the Dionysus who appears on the stage is the god in person. However, the god is a νεανίσκος (youth) as the context of *Fr.* 61 makes plain,[312] whereas the current representation of the god in Aeschylus' time was still that of a bearded figure. This is shown by the hydria from Cracow (mid fifth century) which Deichgräber describes in detail with illustrations (pp. 291 ff. Table 1). Plainly Aeschylus, in his presentation of Dionysus as a young man in the *Edoni*, had been inspired by the hymn to Dionysus or by a general characteristic of the myths about Dionysus, in which the god had to carry on a struggle with mortals to preserve his cult, and in which perhaps the new god was always presented as a youth.[313]

(ii) In the epic versions of the Lycurgus myth Dionysus is accompanied by his nurses. In Aeschylus the chorus in the *Edoni,* as can be seen from the title, is not made up of the god's followers, but of Lycurgus' subjects. We do not know their relationship to Dionysus; they obviously report to the king about the god and his following in the anapaests of the parodos (*Fr.* 57 N^2, cf. Deichgräber 245 ff.). We do not know whether these followers (as a subsidiary chorus?) appear on the stage in the action. Naevius' *Lycurgus* plainly had a chorus of bacchants who were carried off into captivity (see Deichgräber 259), but that need not go back to Aeschylus. In Accius' *Stasiastae sive Tropaeum Liberi* the title gives the impression that the chorus in that play take Dionysus' side.

(iii) In the epic the punishment for Lycurgus' opposition is that Zeus strikes him blind. In the *Edoni* the king's palace falls into bacchic ecstasies at the god's epiphany (Fr. 58 N^2). This scene is parallel to the earthquake scene in the *Bacchae*—[Apollodorus] reports that as punishment Lycurgus goes mad and kills his own son; perhaps Aeschylus too staged this murder of Dryas, since the hydria from Cracow, already mentioned, which is at most a few decades later than Aeschylus' *Lycurgeia,* also gives the Apollodoran version of the myth.

(iv) A fragment from the *Bassarae* (23 N^2, 85 M.), reads: ὁ ταῦρος δ'

---

[312] Ar. *Th.* 134ff. Mnesilochus asks the poet Agathon: καί σ' ὦ νεανίσκ' εἴ τις εἶ κατ' Αἰσχύλον / ἐκ τῆς Λυκουργείας ἐρέσθαι βούλομαι· / ποδαπὸς ὁ γύννις; τίς πάτρα; τίς ἡ στολή;

[313] The other possibility is that in the *Edoni* Dionysus, just as he does in Euripides' *Bacchae*, deliberately masquerades as a mortal, since this theme was not thought up by Euripides, but could already be found in Anacreon, cf. Himer. *Or.* 38.13 (p. 155 Colonna, 492 PMG): ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡμᾶς, ὦ παῖδες, ὥσπερ τις θεὸς ὅδε ὁ ἀνὴρ φαίνει οἵους ποιηταὶ πολλάκις εἰς ἀνθρώπων εἴδη μορφάς τε ποικίλας ἀμείβοντες πόλεις τε εἰς μέσας καὶ δήμους ἄγουσιν, ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφέποντες, οἵαν Ὅμηρος μὲν Ἀθηνᾶν, Διόνυσον δὲ Ἀνακρέων Εὐριπίδης τ' ἔδειξαν.

ἔοικεν κυρίξειν.[314] (The bull seemes about to butt). If this bull is Dionysus in the form of a bull, the Lycurgeia also recognize a theriomorphic appearance by the god. Besides, the god in the shape of a bull is not only an element of the myth, but also of the cult. The association of Dionysus with lightning (*Bassarae Fr.* 84 M, Eur. *Ba* 594 f., 1083) also refers to the cult attributes of the god.

(v) There are great uncertainties about the development of the *Lycurgeia's* plots. In [Apollodorus] Lycurgus indeed undergoes a process of σωφρόνησις (coming to his senses), but finally pays with his life. In Sophocles Lycurgus does not die, but is confined in the underground vaults of Mount Pangaion (?), *Ant.* 955 ff. (cf. Deichgräber 277 ff.): οὕτω τᾶς μανίας δεινὸν ἀποστάζει ἀνθηρόν τε μένος (thus he distils the flowering fury of madness). This version can very well go back to Aeschylus; the problem is that the relationship between the two conflicts: Lycurgus-Dionysus (*Edoni*) and Dionysus-Orpheus (*Bassarae*) remains unclarified, in spite of the links that Deichgräber 281 ff. has tried to make.

(II) Pentheus

Besides Polyphrasmon's and Aeschylus' Lycurgeia, the Attic theatre has seen the performance of a number of Pentheus plays. Apart from the *Bacchae* the only one of these of which anything is known is Aeschylus' *Pentheus.* About this play we have:

(i) The remarks in the hypothesis of the *Bacchae* (*Hyp.* Arist. Byz.): ἡ μυθοποιία κεῖται παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ ἐν Πενθεῖ (The story is found in Aeschylus' Pentheus).

(ii) *Fr.* 183 N², 365 M: μηδ' αἵματος πέμφιγα πρὸς πέδῳ βάλῃς (don't throw a drop of blood to the ground).

The quotation seems to be a warning; it is easy to assume that Pentheus is the person addressed; the speaker, if it was in the Bacchae, could have been almost anyone else (cf. p. 123).

(iii) A. *Eum.* 24-26:

(ΠΡΟΦΗΤΙΣ) Βρόμιος ἔχει τὸν χῶρον, οὐδ' ἀμνημονῶ,
ἐξ οὗτε βάκχαις ἐστρατήγησεν θεός,
λαγὼ δίκην Πενθεῖ καταρράψας μόρον.

(Bromios holds the land, I remember, since the time when the god campaigned with his bacchae, / encompassing his fate for Pentheus like a hare.) The scholiast comments: (Σ M): λαγωοῦ δίκην καταπτήξαντι καὶ μὴ

[314] R. Kannicht, Hermes 85 (1957) 285 suggests reading. Adesp. 144 N² in place of the incomprehensible τιν' ἀρχὰν κτλ. with which our fragment continues. He ascribes the words to Orpheus, who sees the bull attack and cries out: τίν' ἀκτάν, τίν ὕλαν δράμω; ποῖ πορευθῶ;

ἀνθισταμένῳ. (Σ T): λαγὼ δίκην· οἱ λαγοὶ δειλοί εἰσιν. φησὶν οὖν αὐτὸν λαγωοῦ δίκην ὑποπτήξαντα μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τοῖς πολεμοῦσιν αὐτόν (Schol. M: like a hare, cowering and not resisting. Schol T: like a hare: hares are cowardly. Therefore he says that he is like a hare when he cowers and does not withstand his enemies.)

Here the scholiast has thought of the proverbial cowardice of the hare (cf. LSJ), but to us the explanation is not attractive: the only surviving line we have does not suggest a cowardly Pentheus in the *Pentheus*; and the military term ἐστρατήγησεν (campaigned), which is possibly imagery, does not give the impression that Pentheus ran away like a hare.[315] Perhaps Aeschylus chose the image of a hare as a hunting metaphor. The hare is a popular prey for hunters in Attica;[316] the word καταρράψας (encompassing) also suggests an image of the hunt.[317] Besides, the line invokes the idea of 'trickery'.[318] Hunting, and Dionysus' defeat of Pentheus by trickery, are both prominent aspects of the Bacchae's plot; the hunting motif occurs throughout, and the trickery motif, by which Dionysus decoys Pentheus away to the mountain, is clearly declared in 848-47:

(ΔΙΟΝ.) γυναῖκες, ἀνὴρ ἐς βόλον καθίσταται,
ἥξει δὲ βάκχας, οὗ θανὼν δώσει δίκην.[319]

(Dion.: women, the man is at the snare, he will come to the bacchae, where, dying, he will pay the penalty.)

Because Aristophanes remarks that Aeschylus' *Pentheus* has the same μυθοποιία (story) as the *Bacchae*, it seems reasonable to assume that Aeschylus in the *Eumenides* was referring to the plot of his own *Pentheus*. To summarize:

motif	Hom. Eum. Stes.	A.*Lyc.*	*Hymn to Dionysus*	A.*Penth.*	Eur.*Ba.*
Dion. appears as a young man	—	+	+	?	+
Dion. appears as an animal	—	+	+	?	+
Dion. captured and freed by an epiphanic miracle	—	+	+	?	+
Warning (from a servant)	—	?	+	+	+
Means of destruction by the god are bacchae	—	—	—	+	+
Destruction compared to a hunt	—	?	—	+	+

---

[315] See Dodds, *Introd.* xxxv and ad 52.
[316] Ar. *Vesp.* 709 and Starkie ad loc.
[317] Cf. Groeneboom and Headlam-Thomson ad loc.
[318] Hesych s.v. ῥάπτειν· μηχανᾶσθαι, κατασκευάζειν. Cf. Deichgräber (1939) 306.
[319] Compare too 805-06: Πε. οἴμοι· τόδ' ἤδη δόλιον ἔς με μηχανᾷ. Δι. ποῖόν τι, σῶσαί σ' εἰ θέλω τέχναις ἐμαῖς;

The god employs trickery for the destruction	—	—	—	+	+
The opponent dies	+ Hom.	?	+	+	+

(+ present; — absent; ? no data)

We can establish that the epiphanic motifs of the hymn to Dionysus, and of the *Bacchae,* are also present in Aeschylus' *Lycurgeia,* while we have no data about his *Pentheus.* So far as the plot of the *Bacchae* is concerned, according to our limited data some motifs seem to be typical of both Pentheus plays, whereas they are not present in the hymn, and probably not in the Lycurgeia either:

(i) The god's opponent is killed by bacchae, who are the instruments of his vengeance. The bacchae in the *Pentheus* are the same as those in the *Bacchae.* After all, the resemblances to other myths of opposition in which the daughters of Proteus, Minyas or Eleuther make up the destructive force, indicate that this aspect of the myth contains the *aition* of a rite, and that Pentheus' downfall by his mother's hand was not dreamed up by Euripides.[320]

(ii) The god uses a trick to get his victim into the mountains or, possibly in Aeschylus, to separate him from his army.

(iii) The victim is hunted by the bacchae like an animal and killed. In Euripides the hunting motif is expressed mainly in an often used metaphor, and in the references made to Pentheus about the example of Actaeon, but in fact there is no hunting of Pentheus by his mother and her sisters. There may well have been in the case of Aeschylus,[321] whose image of the hare makes one suspect something of the sort. Naevius *Lycurgus Fr.* 8 R (37-38 W.) speaks about 'in venatu vitulantes', but the text and the speakers of the lines are uncertain.[322]

In so far as the data we have about Dionysus plays before Euripides make it possible to compare either the story or the plot of the *Bacchae* with its predecessors in tragedy, it may be concluded that Euripides introduced no great innovations to the actual course of events in the conflict between Pentheus and Dionysus. It is probably quite otherwise with the referential aspects of meaning, which are condensed into a conceptual aspect: τί τὸ σοφόν (what is cleverness?). This question by the chorus is relevant to the whole action, since the word σοφός (wise), apart from in the scene of Cadmus and Teiresias, is used continually to characterize the actions of the god, by the god himself (480, 641, 656, 839), or by others

---

320 Dodds, *Introd.* xxvi and xxxii.

321 Cf. J. Roux p. 545.

322 According to Deichgräber (1939) 258 and n. 5 the words were said by Lycurgus' bodyguards. Others ascribe them to the chorus.

(489, 655, 824, 1190), and is obviously contrasted with the concept of τὸ σοφόν (cleverness) (203, 395, 877 = 897, 1005). On these grounds one can suppose that the crucial point of the *Bacchae*, the god driving his adversary mad, is Euripides' most important innovation, and that the trick which Dionysus used in Aeschylus' *Pentheus*, was of some other (military?) kind; in the *Bacchae* the god's trick is closely linked with σοφία (wisdom), or perhaps more closely with τὸ σοφόν (cleverness); the god defeats his adversary in the end with his most ingenious weapon, μανία (madness).

CHAPTER EIGHT

DIONYSUS (3): THE GOD'S EPIPHANIES IN THE *BACCHAE*

In comparing the Homeric hymn to Dionysus with the *Bacchae* (p. 123) it has been established that in his play Euripides prevented the appearance of the actor portraying Dionysus from acquiring the naturalness of an epic epiphany; the poet achieved this by continually bringing the audience face to face with the fact that the appearance of the Lydian had an epiphanic character, but that at the same time this epiphanic character was not experienced by Pentheus; in other words, the poet applied a sort of alienation effect. It was then suggested that Euripides weaves together the epiphanic motives in his plot into the principium actionis: the continuous oppressive or liberating presence of a god among mortals. Consideration of the epiphanic action of the god in the *Bacchae* supports these claims.

In the prologue and the exodos of the *Bacchae* we meet a theatrical convention frequently used by Euripides, the appearance of a divinity on the stage. This appearance can be called a stage epiphany; from the spectator's point of view these appearances have no referential aspects of meaning, because the way in which the god speaks his prologue or appears as a deus ex machina on the tragic stage, does not refer to the way in which gods might be perceived in the reality outside the theatre. This stage epiphany therefore stands outside the categories of epic, mythical, cult and soteriological epiphanies (p. 114f.), and the action of the god taking part in the complications of the plot is in strong contrast to it. As speaker of the prologue the contrast lies in his addressing himself exclusively to the audience, while the god who acts with mortal characters on the stage is imitating a mythical or cult practice; as deus ex machina in his addressing himself, whether from the theologeion or from the machina, directly to the characters in the play, while his performance is no imitation, but a code, by which an actor makes the fact visible that gods interfere in the lives of men in order to achieve their ends.[323] The spectator does not see

[323] This review of the epiphanic nature of Dionysus' actions in the *Bacchae* is not the place to discuss the function of the deus ex machina, but see G. Murray, *Euripides and his Age* 221ff.—Gerd Kremer, *Die Struktur des Tragödienschlusses* (in W. Jens ed., *Bauformen* 117ff.) makes a distinction between 'Ecceschluss' and 'Handlungsschluss' (cf. above n. 219). The ecce-ending (sometimes too: Präsentationsschluss) is primarily directed at an explanation of what happens in the action (= the story), both past and to come. The exodos with 'Handlungsschluss' is more like a normal episode: here the action gets a new impetus, and the tragedy is only brought to its end in the last scenes. A remark by the

the theatrical representation of a religious experience, an epiphany, but decodes the code in strict narrative terms: this was the god's will in the story told about him, this was the way history continued in the period after that of the play, and so on.

The appearance of Dionysus in the course of the *Bacchae's* action (between 434 and 1088), is on the other hand a continuous epiphany, because it is a mimesis of epiphany. But what could this have meant to the spectator of Euripides' day? He knows that in the myth about Pentheus the god appeared in Thebes, just as in all the myths about Dionysus he makes a local appearance to establish his cult;[324] he also knows that the god appears in the practices of the cult (in the ἱερὸς γάμος (sacred marriage) at the Anthesteria, as an orgiastic god in the τελεταί (initiation rites), as Iacchos at the Lenaea[325]). In addition he would be conscious, far more strongly than a modern man would be likely to be, of the god's presence in wine, and in all the facets of moist nature nourished by sap. But for the audience, and certainly for Euripides himself, the appearance of Dionysus in an epic epiphany would have been an intolerable archaism in their theatre, since it would have seriously disturbed the theatrical reality as an imitation of life. The god does not therefore appear as a god, but as a mortal, and indeed as a travelling stranger from Lydia. So there is NO appearance of the GOD. For the mortal participants the separation of god and stranger is an absolute separation, since there would be no more imitation of reality if they were to see the stranger acting as a god. Ignorance about the true identity of the stranger affects the god's female companions from Lydia as much as it does the inhabitants of Thebes; the male leader of the thiasos is certainly not the god to the chorus, cf. 547 ff.: τὸν ἐμὸν... θιασώταν σκοτίαις κρυπτὸν ἐν εἱρκταῖς. ἐσορᾷς τάδ', ὦ Διὸς παῖ, Διόνυσε; (the leader of my thiasos hidden in a dark prison. Do you see this, Dionysus, son of Zeus?). The palace miracles alter this ignorance not at all (613 πῶς ἠλευθερώθης; How were you set free?) and the stranger carefully maintains the separation (623, 630). Even when he brings into the struggle his divine weapon, mania, before the watching audience, he maintains the separation (849-50, 975-76), which for the victim is only removed in his delusion (920-22). When the stranger disappears into thin air just before the sparagmos of Pentheus (we do not see him go, but he is suddenly no longer there, 1077), the thought still does not strike Pentheus' bodyguard that the voice that he

author about the *Hipp.*, which he recognizes as an ecce-ending, is valid in my opinion for all appearances of a deus ex machina in Euripides (p. 136): 'Funktion der Götterszene ist es vielmehr, das Ecce zu vertiefen'.

[324] Cf. Marcello Massenzio, *Cultura e crisi permanente: la 'xenia' dionisiaca,* Rome 1970.

[325] Cf. H. S. Versnel, ΙΑΚΧΟΣ, Talanta 4 (1972) 23-38.

has heard (φωνή τις, 1078) should be connected with the disappearance of the Lydian; a surprised statement by anyone at all in the play, that 'the stranger was the god himself', is lacking. This is entirely natural; not because such a statement would be superfluous (the audience knew it already), but because such a statement would lack reality in Euripides' theatre. We can imagine how the god, after setting his affairs in order in Thebes, might continue his journey (cf. 48-50) with the accompanying troop of Lydian women, who in some new adventure might just as unwittingly call upon the god to come and liberate their leader a second time from the grip of oppression.

Euripides keeps to this absolute separation of god and stranger in the action to satisfy the demands which he makes of his play as an imitation of life. So the theatrical reality appears to be real life for the characters in the play. But in this theatrical reality the god Dionysus is present, and indeed visible to the audience, in the shape of the stranger from Lydia. Without the characters realizing it, they have a continuous experience of the god made manifest. The quality of epic epiphany in the stranger's actions is continually brought to the notice of the audience; they do not have the opportunity to ascribe the stranger's actions to the naturalness of an epic epiphany. The poet's shrinking from the naturalness of an epic epiphany has previously been called an alienation effect; indeed, the tragic irony used by the poet with respect to his mortal characters, who do not know that the Lydian is the god Dionysus, has its counterpart in the tragic irony which he uses in respect of his god on the stage: the Lydian cannot be a god for the other characters in the play, but at the same time the god cannot be a Lydian for the audience, but is all along represented by the poet as the god who manipulates δόλοι (tricks) and τέχναι (schemes) to maintain his illusion. So the spectator sees through the god's finesse (a finesse that is also his weakness) in the account he gives the chorus of the events which have gone on indoors during the palace miracles: αὐτὸς ἐξέσωσ' ἐμαυτὸν ῥᾳδίως ἄνευ πόνου (Myself I rescued myself, easily, without effort, 614) is shortly followed by an artificial formula: κᾆθ' ὁ Βρόμιος, ὡς ἔμοιγε φαίνεται, δόξαν λέγω, / φάσμ' ἐποίησεν κατ' αὐλήν (and then Bromios, it seems to me, I think, made a phantom in the courtyard, 629 f.). But the peak of tragic irony used by the poet with regard to the god is in lines 810 ff., previously discussed in detail in chapter 5, where the god is forced to bring into play his last μηχανή (device), mania, and thereby reveals the fiasco of his double identity.

How is the continuous nature of the epiphany shown in the god's actions?[326] Euripides does this in two ways. In the first place he does it by

[326] Particularly Winnington-Ingram commented upon this epiphanic nature, see the index of his book under *epiphany* and *sight*.

using the image building power of many of the words he uses, image building in the sense that they are expressions of the manifestations of Dionysus' presence in the play.[327] In the second place he does it by creating in the action of his play a number of points at which the mythical, cult, or soteriological epiphany of the god becomes reality.

Cult epiphanies in the parodos

In the parodos of the *Bacchae*, which is structured like a cult hymn to Dionysus,[328] the chorus describe to the audience how the god is made manifest in the bacchic rites. This epiphany is a cult epiphany in the sense that the god appears to his worshippers during the *oreibasia* (dancing in the mountains). It is remarkable in a cult hymn of this sort to a god, that the parodos describes not so much the nature (φύσις) of the god, as the nature of the mortals who celebrate his rites (first strophe, 72-87). After a digression into the myth of the god's birth (his γένος, first antistrophe, 88-104) the chorus return to the celebration of the rites, and call on Thebes too to worship the god, at the same time giving detailed instructions on how to prepare for the *oreibasia* (second strophe 105-19). A second digression into the myth describes in a syncretic amalgam (cf. Dodds ad loc.) the musical terms used in the orgiastic rites: Curetes, Corybants and Satyrs play the kettledrum and the aulos (second antistrophe, 120-34). Finally the epode describes the culminating point of the oreibasia:

---

[327] Euripides in the *Bacchae* uses many words which imply some sense perception of hearing or sight in a meaning that points either to the god's epiphany, or to the manifestation of his power:

(i) hearing ἀλαλάζειν 592, 1103; αὐδᾶν, αὐδή 576, 580; ἀναβοᾶν 1079, 1154; ἐπιβρέμειν 151; δοῦπος 513; εὐάζειν, εὐάσματα 67, 129, 151; ἠχή 1086; ἰαχή 149; ἐπικελεύειν 1088; κελευσμός 1089; κτύπος 129; κτυπεῖν 240; μέλπειν 155; ὀλολύζειν 24, 689; τύμπανα 59, 156; ὑμνεῖν 71; φωνή 1078.

(ii) sight ἀθρεῖν 1281, 1326; αὐγάζεσθαι 596; γάνος 383; δεικνύναι 47, 50, 1200; θέαμα 760; θεατής 829; θεωρία 1047; αἴθοπα λαμπάδα 594; λεύσσειν 596, 1232, 1280; οἰνωπός 236, 438; γελῶντι προσώπῳ 1021; ὁρᾶν 61, 306, 470, 477, 500, 502, 591, 634, 664, 713, 737, 740, 760, 811, 814, 815, 912, 914, 918, 924, 927, 940, 983, 1018-9, 1050, 1058, 1062, 1063, 1075, 1077, 1095, 1172, 1175, 1238, 1244, 1258, 1279, 1282, 1384; ὄψις 1232, 1257; ὄσσε 236, 1060, 1167, 1385; πυρσώδης 146; πῦρ 596, 624, (758), 778, 1083; ῥέω 142-3; ῥοή 711; σκέψαι 1279; κατασκοπή, κατάσκοπος 838, 916, 956; στάζειν, σταγών 711, 741, 767, 1164; φαίνειν 42, 182, 528, 925, 1018, (1031), 1283; φανερός, ἐμφανής 22, 501, 991 = 1011, 1199; φάσμα (φῶς LP) 630; φῶς 608, 1083; φαεννός 631; φλόξ 146; φλέγειν 595, 1019.

(iii) keeping silent: ἀκούειν 1085; σιγῇ 816; σιγᾶν 1084, On *proskynesis* it is worth mentioning that in the Bacchae διχεῖν (600) and πίπτειν, πέσημα (136, 588, 605, 753, 756, 1022, 1112, 1115) are used in this sense.

[328] J. C. Kamerbeek, *Deux passages des Bacchantes d'Euripide*, Mnem. IV. 6 (1953) 193; A. J. Festugière, *La signification religieuse de la Parodos des Bacchantes*, Eranos 54 (1956) 72-86.

(135) A sweet joy on the mountains is he, who leaves the racing thiasos, and throws himself to the ground in the holy wrapping of a fawnskin—hunting for the blood of the goat that is rent, for the joy of the living flesh devoured, rushing over the mountains of Phrygia, Lydia;

then the leader is the roaring god. Euoi.

The land flows with milk, flows with wine, flows with nectar of bees.

(144) A scent as of Syrian incense rises: the god Bacchus raises high the glowing flame of his resinous torch. He jumps up with his narthex, he runs and dances. So he inflames those wandering around him, he excites them by his cries, he lets his soft locks float in the wind. The cry of euoi rings out. Above it his deep voice roars: 'On my bacchae, on my bacchae'.

(154) O Luxuriance of Tmolus running with gold in his mountain streams: sing you of Dionysus, dance for him to the loud roll of the kettledrums,

shout the euoi for the god of euoi with Phrygian shrieks and cries, whenever the holy wooden flute with joyful note rings out its sacred melody and pipes the measure for the runners—to the hills, to the hills.

See, happy as a foal by its grazing mother the bacchant runs skipping on.

The epode, by its content and its metrical structure, falls into three parts: (a) the ultimate actions of a bacchant, sparagmos and omophagia, make the presence of the god visible, while miracles accompany his manifestation: the earth flows with milk, wine and honey (135-43); (b) a description of the god made manifest (144-53); (c) the delight of the bacchant, who carries on his dance over the mountain in great happiness and to ecstatic music (154-169). In this last part of the epode Euripides returns to the actual celebrants of his play, the Lydian women who have arrived in Thebes: the general use of the masculine in (a) has become specifically feminine in (c). Line 135 is the subject of one of the most disputed questions of textual criticism in the Bacchae; the interpretation followed in the translation above is defended in Appendix 4.

The cult epiphany which the chorus describe, produces feelings of joy and liberation among the celebrants of the rites.

Cult epiphanies in the action

So in the parodos of the *Bacchae* Euripides describes the orgiastic oreibasia, not so much to create an atmosphere for his play of being about the orgiastic god, as to show the features of the orgiastic *cult* clearly to his audience as the norm, against which the events in his play will be played out. This norm (the cult) has four phases: an inner (72-87) and an outward (105-19) preparation; a bloody ritual (135-40); a manifestation of

the god (141-53); and a joyful dance of release over the mountains (154-69).

In his treatment of the Theban women in the plot of the *Bacchae* Euripides has used a heavy irony in respect to the norm of the cult. There is no question in their case of an inner preparation for the oreibasia; they are ἀτέλεστοι (uninitiated, 32-40), not τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδυῖαι (knowing the rites of the gods, 73). Their outward preparations (23-25) look like an illustration of the Orphic saying: πολλοὶ μὲν ναρθηκοφόροι, παῦροι δέ τε βάκχοι (many carry the narthex, but few are bacchants, Orph. *Fr.* 5, Pl. *Phd.* 69c), but that is appearance only. It is the god himself who has equipped them as bacchae, and he gives the signs of his parousia in 704-11, not so much to the women themselves, who have been deprived of their understanding, but (via the herdsman) to Thebes; just at this point the poet makes the herdsman interrupt his account to Pentheus, 712-13; ὥστ', εἰ παρῆσθα, τὸν θεὸν τὸν νῦν ψέγεις / εὐχαῖσιν ἂν μετῆλθες εἰσιδὼν τάδε (so that, if you had been there, and seen it, the god whom you now condemn you would have approached with prayers). The god does not appear in person to these women, but he certainly compels them, as another warning sign to the refractory city, to carry out in full the bloody rituals which, in the cult, would have made his worshippers one with their god. The women tear living cattle to pieces (737-47) and steal children away from their villages (748-68) to serve them for ὠμοφάγιον (a meal of raw flesh) in a form of the ritual which possibly also featured at one time in the cult.[329]

The ritual of sparagmos is repeated in 1114-36, but this time Pentheus is the victim. The god makes his presence known by the sound of his voice and by a flash of light (1078-83); the poet reminds us of the women's delusions in Agave's absurd utterance (1106 ff.): φέρε, περιστᾶσαι κύκλῳ / πτόρθου λάβεσθε, μαινάδες, τὸν ἀμβάτην θῆρ' ὡς ἕλωμεν, μηδ' ἀπαγγείλῃ θεοῦ / χοροὺς κρυφαίους (come, stand round in a circle, take hold of the branch, maenads, so that we can catch the mounted beast, so that he cannot tell of the god's secret dances). Agave does not use the word θήρ (beast) metaphorically, since she really sees her capture as a lion (1141-46, 1169-71, etc). From the point of view of the ritual Pentheus is, at the moment of sparagmos, an incarnation of the god, in so far as the idea is correct that it is the god who is torn to pieces in these rites.[330] But

---

[329] Cf. Dodds *Introd.* xviiif. and J. P. Guépin, *The Tragic Paradox* 35, 166f.

[330] Cf. p. 110 and n. 277. The god of life-giving forces is naturally present, in one way or another, in strong or young life that is destroyed. This is not the same as saying that this destruction is a sacrament, involving eating the living god (cf. Guépin p. 227ff.). If Euripides was aware of this (Orphic?) doctrine, he does not say so. In the theatrical reality of the *Bacchae* there is no explicit reference on the level of descriptive meaning, so one cannot assume that such a referential meaning can be given to the action.

at the descriptive and participational levels of meaning Pentheus naturally remains Pentheus to the audience, just as he does for his bodyguard who comes to tell of what has happened; it is his pitiable head (κρᾶτα δ' ἄθλιον, 1139) which Agave bears with her. What we on the outside (the bodyguard who tells the story, and the audience who hear it) perceive is not epiphany like the joyful meeting of the god with his worshippers; what we see is Agave running over the hills as if in a dance of release (the fourth phase of the cult epiphany), with Pentheus' head impaled on her thyrsus (1139-47), and so arriving in Thebes. In the last stasimon (1153-64) the chorus dance this dance of joy with her. In this joyful dance the poet has heightened the irony in a truly grim way, for if we compare the joyful dance of the bacchae during the cult epiphany (154-69) with this fifth stasimon, then the joyful expressions of their earlier ecstasy[331] seem to be replaced by an ecstasy of death, lamentation, and tears: 'Let us dance it out to Bacchus, let us shout it out: misfortune has befallen Pentheus, offspring of the snake. He took women's clothes, and the beautiful ritual staff, which made his death certain, and he was led to his fate by the bull(god). Bacchae, daughters of Cadmus, you have brought the god's victory song to its last triumphal strophe: to lamentations and tears. A fine ordeal: to embrace your child with an arm dripping with his blood'.[332]

---

[331] χλιδά, μέλπετε, ἀγαλλόμεναι, λωτὸς ἱερός, ἱερὰ παίγματα, ἡδομένα, σκιρτήμασι.

[332] The text in P is less corrupt, I think, than is often thought:

ἀναχορεύσωμεν Βάκχιον, ἀναβοάσωμεν ξυμφορὰν
  τὰν τοῦ δράκοντος ἐκγενέτα Πενθέως
  ὃς τὰν θηλυγενῆ στολὰν νάρθηκά τε, πιστὸν Ἀΐδα
ἔλαβεν εὔθυρσον,
  ταῦρον προηγητῆρα συμφορᾶς ἔχων.
βάκχαι Καδμεῖαι,
  τὸν καλλίνικον κλεινὸν ἐξεπράξατε
ἐς γόον, ἐς δάκρυα.
  καλὸς ἀγών, ἐν αἵματι στάζουσαν
  χέρα περιβαλεῖν τέκνου.

Metre: iambo-dochmiac.

⏖⏑–⏓–´⏓⏖⏖⏑–´⏓––⏑–	3 δ
⏓–⏑–⏑–´⏖––⏑–	2 δ (= ia trim sync)
⏓––⏖–´⏑––⏓⏖´–⏑–⏑– ‖	3 δ
⏑⏖–⏓–	δ
⏓–⏑–⏓–⏑–⏑–⏑– ‖	ia trim (= 2 δ)
⏓––⏓–	δ
⏓–⏑–⏓–⏑–⏑–⏑⁀ ‖	ia trim (= 2 δ)
⏓⏖–⏑⏖	δ
⏖⏑–⏑–´⏑––⏓–	2 δ
⏖⏖⏑–⏑– ⦀	δ

We are faced here with several cases in which the longer form of the dochmiacs appears (scansion: ⏓–⏑–⏑–), whose existence was pointed out by Miss Dale LM 114ff. (and in-

The ἀγών, the ordeal that bacchant must perform by the sparagmos of her prey,[333] has been accomplished with great success by Agave. She will now be accepted as a fully qualified member of the thiasos: σε δέξομαι σύγκωμον, 1172.[334] But Agave, when she comes to her senses after celebrating her triumph, has not seen the god: she has, however, acquired the understanding the god wished her to have (40 ἐκμαθεῖν...ἀτέλεστον οὖσαν τῶν ἐμῶν βακχευμάτων, 'to learn that (the city)

---

deed named by C. J. Ruijgh: 'procephalic hypodochmiac'). Two such dochmiacs (1159 and 1161) make up an iambic trimeter: the combination of this sort of dochmiac with an ordinary one (1155) can be thought of as a syncopated trimeter. In 1164 there is only this dochmiac. It is also seen in the previous stasimon, cf. n. 381 and Miss Dale LM 116. We must accept the dochmiac in 1164 as a clear exception in the 'Protean diversity of form shown by this colon' (Miss Dale LM 105), since the text cannot be shortened (see below). *Text. 1155* The Antinoe papyrus confirms the correctness of ἐκγενέτα Πενθέως (P) against Wilamowitz's transposition: Πενθέος ἐκγενέτα.

1156 πιστὸν Ἅιδαν is corrected by the payrus: πι[..]οναιδα. The word πιστόν qualifies νάρθηκα: 'warrant of his death' (LSJ s.v. III); Pentheus' thyrsus, together with his whole maenad equipment, was the guarantee that the king was going to meet his downfall.—On metrical grounds we should not write the genitive as Ἅιδα (Dodds, J. Roux), but as a cretic: Ἀΐδα, cf. von Wilamowitz ad *Her.* 116 and Collard ad *Supp.* 918-24. In *Hec.* 1031 too the reading of the MSS. can be upheld: θανάσιμον πρὸς Ἀΐδαν· ἰὼ τάλας ⏑⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–⏑–⏑– two dochmiacs.

1163-64 I accept P's text; περιβαλεῖν (βαλεῖν Wecklein, Dodds, J. Roux) is necessary: the ἀγών is in his mother's bloody embrace at the moment of sparagmos. The composite περιβάλλειν is a favourite word of Euripides; Aristophanes parodies this partiality *Ra.* 1322 (G. W. Bond in W. B. Stamford ad loc.) and *Th.* 914. Finally, τέκνου belongs ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with αἵματι and περιβαλεῖν. Although one might expect τέκνῳ grammatically (*coniecit* Kirchhoff), τέκνου gives a calculated effect of shock: the blood dripping from the arm is the blood of her child: that is what qualifies the ἀγών as καλός—contrary to Madame Roux I do not believe that at the end of the chorus 'la commisération l'emporte sur l'ironie'.

[333] An indication that we should interpret ἀγών in this sense is to be found in *Hypsipyle*, a play in which Euripides also apparently wrote about the cult epiphany of Dionysus during the oreibasia. *Fr.* 57.10 reads: τί τὸ σημα̣[and probably contained a question such as: 'What is the sign of Bacchus' presence?' (Bond), followed by a summary of the phenomena listed in *Bacchae* 142: wine, milk, honey, incense. The strophe ends:

18 χάριν α̣[
19 ἀντάγω̣[ν

Dodds has suggested (in Bond ad loc.) reading line 19 as: ἀντ' ἀγῶνος, 'the words may be taken with χάριν as a description of the effect of Dionysus' gifts'. The joy which Dionysus grants his worshippers is a reward for undergoing the test of sparagmos and omophagia. The god tells Pentheus of this test, which Pentheus must undergo as the victim, in 963f.: μόνος σὺ πόλεως τῆσδ' ὑπερκάμνεις, μόνος· / τοιγάρ σ' ἀγῶνες ἀναμένουσιν οὓς ἐχρῆν.

[334] Harry L. Levy, Mnem. IV. 26 (1973) 282-84 wants to interpret 1167 δέχεσθε κῶμον εὐίου θεοῦ as: 'Accept her into the revel of the Euian god', either by construing δέχεσθαι with two accusatives as in *Ion* 1314 τοὺς ἀδίκους βωμὸν ... ἵζειν (but ἵζειν here is 'sit' (intransitive), not 'sit them down' (transitive), cf. LSJ s.v. II), or be emending to δέχεσθ' ἐς κῶμον. It is really not plausible that the leader of the chorus should leave unannounced the most spectacular element of Agave's arrival: the head of Pentheus impaled on her thyrsus. By Agave's appearance ἐν διαστρόφοις ὄσσοις, by announcing her as μήτηρ, looking back to 1164, and by the head of Pentheus, they are brought together, the living Agave and the dead Pentheus, as the glorious κῶμος of the god.

has not been initiated into my Bacchic rites'), and she understands the meaning of this lesson, 1296: Διόνυσος ἡμᾶς ὤλεσ', ἄρτι μανθάνω (it is Dionysus who has destroyed us, now I understand).

The poet's irony with respect to the cult epiphany, which he has described in the parodos, lies in the fact that everything which has a place in the *orgia* also finds its place in reality in the action of the play, with one exception: the personal, joyful, appearance of the god. That this appearance has no place in the play is self-evident: in Thebes the god is not among his worshippers, but reveals himself to those who scorn him. The Theban women have not experienced the feelings of joy and release which the celebrants of the rites experience, according to the chorus in the parodos, at the cult epiphany of the god. The *Bacchae*'s plot therefore has a consistently worked out story nucleus: divine punishment, which is accomplished with the most macabre ritual, and without the liberating epiphany of the god. In such a way is this god continuously and oppressively present for his victims.

Soteriological epiphany in the action

The plot of the *Bacchae* does, however, recognize one group who worship the god, the Lydian women who appear as the chorus. They are provided with an epiphany by the poet, but at the same time he imposes considerable restrictions. The worshippers themselves do not recognize the joyful appearance of the god, because for them it is not the god, but the stranger, who comes out of the palace, and the stranger immediately devalues their prostrations to the manifest god by his realistic comment, 604 f.: βάρβαροι γυναῖκες, οὕτως ἐκπεπληγμέναι φόβῳ / πρὸς πέδῳ πεπτώκατε; (you foreign women, are you so struck with fear, that you prostrate yourselves?)[335]

The suggestion of an epiphany in the scene of the palace miracles (576 ff.) is created by the god's voice, which rings out in a roar from the palace,[336] by a heavy concentration of the sort of words which accompany

[335] Euripides' ironical comparison in 604 can be compared to the moment when the first episode begins. The epiphany song of the parodos has ended with the image of a frisking foal; immediately afterwards blind old Teiresias comes on as a bacchant: γόνυ πάλλεται γερόντων (Ar. *Ra.* 345).

[336] It is probable that the protagonist played the roles of Pentheus and Agave (thus Wecklein), not those of Dionysus and Teiresias (thus J. Roux). Apart from the fact that the first combination is the most rewarding, and has been played by great actors (Jason of Trallos) or would-be actors (the emperor Nero), it also demands the greatest technical efforts, particularly in Agave's amoibaion. Here the actor has the largest singing part: 25 out of 34 cola, whereas in Dionysus' amoibaion with the chorus the actor sings seven cola out of 28. Moreover, the Dionysus actor is not visible to the public, so that it is conceivable that this part too was sung by the protagonist. Finally one must not exclude the possibility that the Pentheus-Agave actor also sang a monody in the exodos, cf. n. 236.

the audible and visible signs of an epiphany (cf. n. 327), and by the women's ecstasy, which finally makes them prostrate themselves (600 ff.) in expectation of the god's imminent appearance to them: δίκετε πεδόσε δίκετε τρομερὰ / σώματα μαινάδες· / ὁ γὰρ ἄναξ ἄνω κάτω τιθεὶς ἔπεισι / μέλαθρα τάδε Διὸς γόνος (cast to the ground, cast your trembling bodies to the ground, maenads; for the king, the son of Zeus, will come to upset these halls).[337] It is possible that a few mechanically operated effects were added (a shift of part of the architrave, smoke), but if this was the case, they would have had a modest share in the whole experience of an epiphany which was offered to the spectator.[338] This manifestation of Dionysus is soteriological;[339] summoned by an invocatory hymn the god comes to save his worshippers from the grip of oppression.[340] His ap-

[337] For the metre of 576-603 cf. Wilamowitz *Gr. V.* 580f. Almost the whole amoibaion is made up of trochees, dactyls, and cretics (paeons), a metrical mirror of the epiphany in the parodos, cf. App. 4. The cretics (paeons) are true cretics (paeons, Wilamowitz), not syncopated trochees (Dodds). 576, 580 and 581 are generally accepted as pherecrateans, but thanks to the strong caesura in all three I hear the lines continuously rather as an ionicus than as a choriambus (κλύετ' αὐδᾶς, πάλιν αὐδῶ, ὁ Διὸς παῖς). The first ionicus of each colon is syncopated: ὁ Σεμέλας ⏑.⏑⏑–. 577 ἰὼ βάκχαι ἰὼ βάκχαι are not 'syncopated dochmii' (Dodds); 'das zwingt man lieber gar nicht in einen Vers' (Wilamowitz). Perhaps they too were sung as ionici.

[338] See Wilamowitz *Gr. V.* 582; his opinion about the visible effects are still fairly generally accepted. The latest contribution to the subject which I know of comes to the same conclusion: Victor Castellani *That troubled house of Pentheus in Euripides' Bacchae* TAPhA 106 (1976) 61-83. Castellani compensates for 'a shortage of stage business' by attaching a symbolic and prophetic meaning to the events in the play: 'A careful look into the words will suggest that the miraculous and truly awesome damage to Pentheus' "house" affects it not materially but spiritually and morally' (p. 67).—J. Roux's ideas about the decor in Greek tragedy have already been disproved by N. C. Hourmouziades *Production and Imagination in Euripides* 14, 20 n. 1, 52 and by di Benedetto ad *Or.* 1366ff. She also has a curous idea of the staging of the production at this point, p. 438: 'Dionysos apparaît, comme dans le prologue, sur le théologeion, visible aux yeux du public mais invisible pour les bacchantes, qui entendent seulement sa voix'. Such a stage epiphany (cf. p. 131) would destroy the epiphanic nature of the action, and would be banal. See too Hourmouziades App. II, especially p. 156 and p. 163.

[339] Symbolism reigns supreme in American universities (cf. n. 338 and 342). According to R. Hamilton, TAPhA 104 (1974) 144ff., the palace miracles represent the manifestation of the birth of Dionysus. The palace is personified into a maenad, and destroyed just like Semele. 'The flaring up of Semele's tomb (596ff.) secures the identification' (p. 146-7). After the miracle nothing more is said about the god's birth: 'Instead it is the epiphany of the bull, that is, the *result* of Dionysus' birth, that commands our attention' (p. 147).

[340] In this ὕμνος κλητικός (556-75) the god is naturally 'sung' into Thebes by the chorus, but many have not appreciated this (see, however, Kirk ad 554). In 565ff. the chorus makes a geographical distinction between Pieria, where the god is worshipped (σέβεται) and Thebes, to which he shall come (ἥξει) and bring his maenads (ἄξει). We must here think in terms of a north-south axis and not an east-west one, as Murray does: 'Blessed Land of Pïerie, / Dionysus loveth thee; / He will come to thee with dancing, / Come with joy and mystery; / With the Maenads at his hest / Winding, winding to the West'. So too Wilamowitz: 'Pierien, selige Landshaft, / dir huldigt der Schwärmer, bald zieht er zu dir'. The north-south axis has consequences for the close of the epode, where the double τε

pearance in Thebes is the fulfilment in the plot of the *Bacchae* of the story nucleus of liberation. The joy which his presence causes finds expression in the way in which the stranger gives his account of the events which have taken place inside the palace. The manner of his narrative is not realistic, but designed to cause the bacchae's mirth, as has been argued in chapter 4 (p. 69).

Mythical epiphany in the action

Dionysus is, with Demeter, the god of epiphany par excellence. The motifs associated with epiphany listed in the Homeric hymn to Dionysus, have already been compared in the previous chapter with those from the *Bacchae* (p. 121 ff.). In the hymn we meet the following elements of mythical epiphany:

(i) the god appears as a mortal, νεηνίῃ ἀνδρὶ ἐοικώς (3), but the helmsman instinctively sees that the captive is a god (17 ff.);

(ii) the ship becomes bacchic: a vine tendril wraps itself around the mast (35 ff.);

(iii) the god makes the φάσμα (likeness) of a bear appear amidships (45 f.);

(iv) the god attacks the captain and the sailors in his theriomorphic manifestation as a lion (44 ff.).

The first element is expressed by Euripides, more delicately and dramatically, in the αἰδώς (embarrassment) of the soldier who arrests the stranger, and in the reaction of Pentheus himself (453 ff.); even though the god is disguised, his divine beauty shows through the disguise, and brings the mortal under its spell. See p. 53.

The second element has been transferred by Euripides, perhaps following the example of Aeschylus' *Edoni*, to Pentheus' palace (cf. p. 126); the third is developed in the φάσματα of a bull (616 ff.) and of the stranger

in 571 and 573 suggests the enumeration of three rivers which the god must cross to reach Thebes, just as the chorus in 402-15 also names three places where it would like to stay: Cyprus, Pharos (see n. 350) and Pieria, and in this song names three mountains, where in the chorus' imagination, Dionysus may perhaps be: Nysa (*quicumque est*), Parnassus and Olympus. One should not, therefore, eliminate τε in 573 and with Wilamowitz transpose πατέρα, but should supply the name of the third river. J. Roux too adheres to three rivers, but assumes the third to be nameless. This is, however, improbable (cf. Dodds); W. Kranz, *Stasimon* 311, has suggested that the Apidanos is offered as the missing name by *Hec.* 451-53: ἢ Φθιάδος, ἔνθα τὸν / καλλίστων ὑδάτων πατέρα / φασὶν Ἀπιδανὸν πεδία λιπαί-νειν. I suggest that the end of the epode should read:

Λυδίαν τε τὸν εὐδαιμονίας βροτοῖς	–⏑–⏑⏑––⏑⏑–⏑–		gl^c (asclep.)
ὀλβοδόταν πατέρα τ'	–⏑⏑–⏑⏑͡		dodr A
<Ἀπιδανόν>, τὸν ἔκλυον	–⏑⏑–⏑–⏑–	‖	dim A
εὔιππον χώραν ὕδασιν	–×–×–⏑⏑–		dim B
καλλίστοισι λιπαίνειν.	–×–⏑⏑––	‖‖	pher

(630). The fourth, Dionysus' theriomorphic manifestation, is not only part of the myth (100), but also of the cult, as appears from the hymn sung by the women in Elis.[341] In the *Bacchae*, however, the god appears (just as he does in the hymn) in his theriomorphic manifestation to punish those who scorn him: the chorus invoke the avenging god to appear in the shape of a bull, a snake or a lion (1018 f.).[342] And indeed the god does appear to Pentheus as a bull.[343]

Euripides has found a fascinating dramatic solution for this fourth element, because the theriomorphic manifestation of the god takes place on the stage, and the audience participate in it through Pentheus' madness, 920-22:

(Πε.) καὶ ταῦρος ἡμῖν πρόσθεν ἡγεῖσθαι δοκεῖς
καὶ σῷ κέρατα κρατὶ προσπεφυκέναι.
ἀλλ' ἦ ποτ' ἦσθα θήρ; τεταύρωσαι γὰρ οὖν.

'Now as a bull you seem to go before me; / Now horns seem to be growing from your head. / Surely you were not a beast before? because without doubt you are a bull now'.

The fascination lies most of all in the fact that now at last, in his madness, Pentheus realizes the true nature of his opponent: ἀλλ' ἦ ποτ' ἦσθα θήρ; 'Surely you were not a beast before?'

---

[341] In Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 36 p. 299 a = *Carm. Pop.* 871 PMG. Cf. Nilsson GGR I 571f.

[342] W. C. Scott, TAPhA 105 (1975) 334-39, has collected the mythical and cult elements of Dionysus as an animal god, together with all other animal imagery from the *Bacchae* (particularly the hunting metaphors) into one heading, that of 'the confusion of men and animals'. In this way he constructs this conception of the *Bacchae*: the distinction between man and beast is blurred in the following characters in the play: Teiresias, Cadmus, the Theban women, and the soldier, as is apparent from their use of language, from their behaviour, and from their dress. This in the end is what happens to Pentheus too (after 918): 'When the king is finally dominated by Dionysus, he also puts on an animal skin completing the symbolic use of costuming in this play' (p. 339).

[343] Cf. too 1159: ταῦρον προηγητῆρα συμφορᾶς ἔχων. The chorus means the bull god Dionysus, of whose victory they sing. But the words could also refer to the stranger, not as the god made manifest in the form of a bull, but as the worshipper of Dionysus masquerading as a bull, as in Aeschylus *Edoni Fr.* 57 N²: ψαλμὸς δ' ἀλαλάζει· ταυρόφθογγοι δ' ὑπομυκῶνταί ποθεν ἐξ ἀφανοῦς φοβεροὶ μῖμοι. Cf. Nilsson GGR I 571 and n. 8.

CHAPTER NINE

SPACE AND ACTION IN THE *BACCHAE*

In their treatment of theatrical space the tragedians observe the conventions that within the tragedy the space on stage offers one and the same scene for the action throughout (exceptions: the *Eumenides* and the *Ajax*); and that to this scene of the action which is visible to the audience there are linked one or more invisible areas, where a large number of events take place which are important for the course of the action, and which can be narrated on stage by characters in the play (for instance by messengers, but not only by them). An action is therefore played out on the stage which is strongly determined by the spoken word. The conflict between two parties *on* stage primarily has the form of a battle of words, while the progress of that conflict in deeds is enacted in an area off-stage. Characters in the drama deliberate about the execution of acts, or persuade each other to specific behaviour, which is put into effect in an area off-stage. On the other hand, the stage is the place where the characters react to whatever has been enacted off-stage: they do this in speech, in lamentations, and so on. This interaction in tragedy between space on stage and invisible areas off-stage has been studied in detail by Klaus Joerden.[344] He devotes a great part of his dissertation to 'die Bühnenhandlung als Konflikt hinterszenischen Räume' (p. 95 ff.). The development of Attic tragedy, he maintains, was marked by different phases in the actual construction of the theatre. Originally (Aeschylus *Persae* and *Septem*) there was only the acting area, and one undifferentiated area outside, which was reached by the parodoi. The conflict on stage was not a struggle between two different interacting forces which demand a decision (τί δράσω; 'what shall I do?) from the characters in the play, but a process of recognition by the characters on-stage under the influence of a power affecting the action from outside: τί πείσομαι; 'what shall I suffer?'

However, in the displacement of the *skene* from below the supporting wall towards the edge of the orchestra (the second phase), as a built-up part of the stage, it acquired the function of distinguishing between left and right. This created two areas beyond the stage, a left and a right, which supported different forces which were conflicting on stage (in

[344] *Hinterszenischer Raum und ausserszenische Zeit. Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik der griechischen Tragödie*. Diss. (masch.) Tübingen 1960. *Zur Bedeutung des Ausser- und Hinterszenische*, in: W. Jens ed., *Bauformen* 369.

Aeschylus' *Hiketides*: the city of Argos on one side, and Egypt on the other). The collison of forces demanded a decision from the characters in the play: τί δράσω; 'what shall I do?'

The third phase lasted for the whole of the fifth century. During this phase the stage building itself acquired the function of a third off-stage area, for instance, a temple or a palace; entries and exits could be made directly via this stage building.[345] From Joerden's study of this differentiation it can be seen how strong its function was in tragedy. The identity which can be shown to exist in Sophocles' plays between the areas beyond the stage, the forces which are being supported on stage, and the characters supporting these forces was, according to Joerden's research,[346] replaced in Euripides by 'eine weitgehende Lockerung und Systemfreiheit'. The application of his theory to the *Bacchae* is examined more closely in this chapter.[347]

From a study of space and action in the *Bacchae* it will also appear that the play's action contains two separate story nuclei, one of escape/liberation, and one of divine vengeance (cf. p. 64). Joerden describes the areas beyond the stage in the *Bacchae* as follows (*Diss.*, p. 258): 'Diese Vergangenheit (i.e. the past history of Dionysus' birth) ist mit dem hinterszenischen Raum verknüpft, der jetzt der eine hinterszenische Raum des Spieles ist, nämlich dem Palast zu Theben, in dem Semele lebte, die nach ihrer Verbindung mit Zeus die Mutter des Dionysos

[345] Since the Oresteia. Joerden points out (*Diss.* Exkurs I: Schauspielerzahl und Rollenwechsel, p. 52-57), that with the *Supplices* the minimum time that an actor needed for a change of role (50 lines) was halved. Nevertheless the relationship between the theatre building and the timing of a tragedy is not so clear: (i) we only have one piece of evidence, the *Supplices*, for the second phase assumed by Joerden; (ii) it is far from certain that the earliest σκηνή at the edge of the orchestra stretched over the full width of the stage. If this was not the case, an actor would have to walk almost as far along under the supporting wall to change his costume. This earliest σκηνή was probably only a modest hut, a dressing room for the actors, that was moved to the edge of the orchestra so as to give them the opportunity of making their exit directly from the acting area. At the same time the outer side of it acquired a function as scenery (palace or temple facade). In the case of the *Bacchae* it is of course true that the Periclean reconstruction of the theatre was almost completed, and that the theatre building, and the north wall of the hall lying behind it, made one continuous back wall from parodos to parodos.

[346] In *Bauformen* 388f.

[347] Joerden researched not only into the 'hinterszenische Raum', but also into the 'ausserszenische Zeit'. He believes that the conflict of the *Bacchae* is fought out over the question of whether or not Dionysus is the son of Zeus: 'also ist die Gegenwart des Spieles letzten Endes damit erfüllt, eine Vergangenheitsstufe richtig zu erkennen' (*Diss.* 258). I agree with Joerden that the recognition of a present fact (that Dionysus is a god), and the correct interpretation of the past (the Semele episode) make up an indivisible whole for the characters in the play and for the audience (Dodds ad 335 differs: 'these are two distinct pleas', but cf. n. 111). But this correct interpretation of the past is pushed into the background by the presence of the stranger/god who wants to impose his will on Thebes. The interpretation of the past is not, as in Sophocles *OT*, the theme of the play.

wurde; diese Tatsache wird von dem Vertreter des Palastes, Pentheus, geleugnet und von Dionysos, der von Nysa, also durch eine Parodos aus dem zweiten hinterszenischen Raum des Stückes kommt, vertreten; es streiten hier also die Abgesandten zweier hinterszenischen Räume um etwas, was in einem der beiden Bereiche geschah; zwischen ihnen hat sich der dritte hinterszenische Raum, die Stadt, schon entschieden, und zwar für Dionysos, denn die thebanische Frauen schwärmen bereits im Kithairon: unter ihnen ist Agaue, also eine Vertreterin des Palastes. Wieder sehen wir, wie die Eindeutigkeit des hinterszenischen Raum als Träger einer Tendenz verloren geht. Der Ort der Mänaden vor der Stadt ist die nähere Ausgangsbasis und Konkretisierung des Bereiches des Dionysos; dieser Bereich ist durch dieselbe Parodos zu erreichen, durch die auch der Weg zur Stadt führt, das zeigen die Verse 840f. und 961. So entsteht ein Wechselspiel zwischen dem hinterszenischen Raum im Bühnenhaus und einem seitlichem hinterszenischen Bereich'.

This analysis by Joerden is, however, open to criticism.

The situation in Thebes which Euripides chooses for the opening of his play is notably different from that described by Joerden. The conflict in the *Bacchae* is a conflict between Dionysus and the whole town of Thebes, not only with Pentheus. It is not true that at the start of the action the city has already chosen Dionysus' side. This can be seen both from the words of Cadmus and Teiresias, 195-96:

Κα. μόνοι δὲ πόλεως Βακχίῳ χορεύσομεν;
Τε. μόνοι γὰρ εὖ φρονοῦμεν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι κακῶς.

(*Ca.* Are we the only ones from the city to dance to the Bacchic one? *Te.* We are the only ones with sense, the others are all wrong), and from the words of the god himself, in 32-42, in which he makes clear that the Bacchic rites are a punishment for the Theban women, which they, (and, because these manifestations of maenadism throw their whole lives into disorder, the men too) have had imposed upon them (cf. p. 35 and n. 90). The god explains that the city must realize that it is not initiated into the bacchic rites (39-40) and therefore it is not included in the chorus' makarismos (72 f.): ὦ μάκαρ ὅστις εὐδαίμων τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδώς... Διόνυσον θεραπεύει (blessed is the happy man who knows the rites of the gods... and worships Dionysus). The city must be summoned to his service (105 ff.): the rites which the women are at that moment performing on Cithaeron are pseudo-rituals, which they carry out after being driven mad and under the compulsion of the god.

In fact, in the *Bacchae*, Euripides has introduced not one, but two contrasts of space.

Contrasts of space

The first contrast is between nearby space, the city of Thebes and the surrounding country over which Pentheus reigns, and the distant space in which Dionysus is recognized as a god. The nearby space is normally called (ἡ, ἥδε) (Θηβαίων) χθών, — γῆ, — πόλις (the land, country, city of Thebes) or simply Θῆβαι (Thebes),[348] using terms which emphasize that it is a political unit.

The distant space is represented in the *Bacchae* by a multitude of geographical and ethnic names which refer to places outside Thebes, and to a great extent even outside Greece: Ἄξιος (river in Macedonia) 569; Ἀπιδανός (river in Thessaly) 575;[349] Ἀραβία 16; Ἀσία 17, 64; Βάκτρα 15; Κρήτη 121; Κύπρος 402; κορυφαὶ Κωρύκιαι 559; Λυδοί, Λύδιος, Λυδία 13, 55, 140, 234, 464; Λυδίας (river in Macedonia) 571: Μῆδοι 16; Νῦσα 556; Ὄλυμπος 289, 411, 554, 561; Πέρσαι 14; Πιερία 410, 565; Σάρδεις 463; Τμῶλος 55, 65, 154, 462; Φάρος (Πάφος LP) 406;[350] Φρύξ, Φρύγιος, 13, 58, 86, 127, 140, 159. Also: βάρβαρος 56, 407, 482.

There is a positive relationship between these places and Dionysus worship. All these geographical references to distant space, the domain of Dionysus, are found in the first part of the play; they end with the ὕμνος κλητικός (invocatory hymn) in 575, and after Dionysus' appearance in the palace miracles they occur no more.[351] This distant space is represented by the left hand parodos (see below).

---

348 1, 20, 23, 39, 50, 61, 105, 195, 213, 215, 216, 276, 357, 362, 450, 454, 529, 660, 664, 770, 961, 963, 1037, 1043, (1199 τᾷδε γᾷ Dindorf), 1295, 1378.

349 See chapter 8, n. 340.

350 406-08: Φάρον θ' ἂν ἑκατόστομοι
βαρβάρου ποταμοῦ ῥοαὶ
καρπίζουσιν ἄνομβροι.
Φάρον Reiske: Πάφον LP.

I find Reiske's emendation entirely acceptable, see the explanation of it by K. O'Nolan CR 8 (1958) 204-06. O'Nolan also argues convincingly against (i) retaining the text (Dodds, Kannicht ad *Hel.* 151) and against (ii) eliminating the Nile (Kamerbeek Mnem. S. IV 6 (1953) 195-97). To his arguments I add one more. With Pharos (i.e. Egypt, cf. *Hel.* 4,460, *El.* 1280-81) Euripides would undoubtedly have thought of the hospitable king Proteus (cf. O'Nolan), considered by Zeus to be the σωφρονέστατος βροτῶν (*Hel.* 47), preserver (διασῴζων) of Menelaos' rights, cf. *Hel.* 48, 60-65. Now the end of the strophe contains a triple ἐκεῖ. The first, ἐκεῖ Χάριτες, refers to the chorus' longing to go to Pieria (410); after all, the Graces live with the Muses on Olympus (Hes. *Th.* 64). The second, ἐκεῖ δὲ Πόθος, refers naturally to the θελξίφρονες Ἔρωτες in Cyprus. The third, ἐκεῖ δὲ βάκχαις θέμις ὀργιάζειν, is perhaps written with particular reference to King Proteus' σωφροσύνη.

351 604 βάρβαροι γυναῖκες and 1168 Ἀσιάδες βάκχαι referring to the chorus, are left out of consideration. The word βάρβαροι in 1334, 1354 and 1356 (Dionysus' prophecy about Cadmus' journey outside Greece) has naturally no connection with the geographical aspects of Dionysus' realm.

The second spatial contrast in the *Bacchae* lies in the differentiation which Euripides introduces within the kingdom of Thebes. First, in the background of the stage stands Pentheus' palace. Second, round about it, and (if the distinction between the significance of left and right in Pollux[352] is valid for the fifth century) in the area back-stage that is approached by the right hand parodos, lies the city. Besides the city as an architectural unit Euripides mentions houses, roads,[353] walls, the prison, and the Electra gate. Third, Cithaeron is very much present in the play. In particular the higher parts of the mountain are mentioned, where the Theban women are. In these cases the poet is not specific, but uses general directions like ὄρος, ὀργάς, λέπας, νάπη, ἄγκος, etc. When it comes to the lower lying and inhabited Theban territory the audience actually hear place names: from Thebes a road runs along the river Asopus through farmland and at one point leads up into the mountains away from the river (1043 ff.); by the river lie the hamlets of Hysiae and Erythrae (749 ff.). In both contexts this lower lying territory is classed as cultivated land.[354] On the other hand the area where the women are is a wilderness, ἐρημία (222, 1176), where lions and wolves dwell,[355] and where there is a natural forest[356] of pines, oak and brushwood.[357] This territory too lies in the area which is reached by the right-hand parodos: Joerden points out[358] that lines 840 and 961 show that the road from the palace to Cithaeron leads through the town. This is also apparent from 352, when Pentheus says: οἳ δ' ἀνὰ πόλιν στείχοντες ἐξιχνεύσατε / τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον, (going through the city to trace out that effeminate stranger), since he knows that he must look for the stranger on Cithaeron (see 237 f.).

The second contrast of space in the *Bacchae* therefore lies hidden in the conflict over the control of palace, city, and mountain, and of the characters associated with each of these areas. The situation at the beginning of the play is that Dionysus is master of the mountain through the

---

[352] *Onom.* 4.126, cf. Joerden *Diss.* 29ff. Joerden follows Rees (just as does Pickard-Cambridge) in his suggestion that the texts make too many exceptions to Pollux's rule for this to be accepted as a theatrical convention in the fifth century. This rigid fixing of the space outside the theatre may not have occurred until the *Nea.* None the less Joerden assumes that the Athenian public distinguished automatically between near and distant space, p. 34: 'es war gleichgültig, wenn sie einmal nicht ausgenutzt wurde, es lag trotzdem rechts ein näherer hinterszenischer Raum, links ein entfernter'.

[353] 68, cf. J. Roux REG 75 (1962) 67. Again in 841.

[354] 750: εὔκαρπον ἐκβάλλουσι Θηβαίων στάχυν, 1043: θεράπνας τῆσδε Θηβαίας χθονός.

[355] lion: 1142, 1196, 1215, 1278, 1283; wolf: 699.

[356] ὕλη: 688, 1084, 1138, 1221.

[357] pine tree: 38, 684, 742, 816, 954, 1061, 1064, 1070, 1095, 1098, 1110; oak: 685, 703, 1103; brushwood: 1229.

[358] *Diss.* 258, quoted p. 145.

agency of the Theban women, whom he has driven mad. The episode in which the women attack Hysiae and Erythrae (748 ff.), can be seen as a conflict between mountain and city, between Dionysus and Thebes, on territory that is linked with both areas.

After the appearance of Dionysus (1) and of the chorus (64), the left-hand parodos, which gives access to distant space, remains unused in the action. All further entrances and exits of the characters take place by the right-hand parodos or by the gate of the palace.[359] The left-hand parodos then only has the function of giving access to the space to which the chorus want to escape (402 ff.: ἱκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον κτλ.—I wish I could go to Cyprus etc.) or from which they implore the coming of Dionysus (556 πόθι Νύσας ... θυρσοφορεῖς ...;—where on Nysa do you bear your thyrsus? Cf. n. 340). When Dionysus has revealed his presence in Thebes to the chorus (576) the left-hand parodos has no further function in the action.

References to the three separate areas, palace, city,[360] and mountain, are fairly constantly found in all the scenes of the *Bacchae*. An exception is the scene 576-641 (chorus-Dionysus), when the god takes possession of the palace. The events are treated twice. First the spectator experiences the miracles in the palace through the eyes of the chorus who are standing in front of it. After this the stranger gives an account of events as he experienced them inside it, see p. 65 ff. and 139 ff. In this passage the palace, and individual parts of it, are described with such a great density of terms that the poet achieves extreme concentration by the audience on this one area.

Dionysus' take-over of the palace is echoed in the more distant space, 748-68. The Theban women leave the desolate mountain tops, and attack the area between city and mountain, the hamlets of Hysiae and Erythrae, which belong to the political territory of Thebes. The women's deeds are miraculous, accomplished not without some divine help (οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινός 764). So the Thebans are confronted with Dionysus' miracles successively in the palace, 576 ff., high in the mountains (peaceful miracles 695-711, bloody miracles 734-47), and in the city's ter-

---

359 This is not certain for Pentheus' entrance in 215, since he is returning from abroad. However, an entrance from the city, therefore from the right, is more obvious for the king; in the antithesis ἔκδημος ὢν μὲν τῆσδ' ἐτύγχανον χθονός, / κλύω δὲ κτλ. we learn that Pentheus reaches his palace via the city, where he has heard the bad news. Even before he appears he has taken a policy decision (the imprisonment of the women, 226).

360 By 'the city' the political entity of Thebes can be meant, as in 1: ἥκω ... τήνδε Θηβαίων χθόνα, or else the city in contrast to the palace and the mountain. In both cases the spectator relates the area behind the stage which is thought of as 'city' to the people connected with this area, in this case the citizens of Thebes.

ritory (gruesome miracles 748-68). Throughout these miracles their divine nature is hidden from Pentheus.

Cadmus and Teiresias

So far as can be seen from the treatment of the areas beyond the stage, the appearance of Cadmus and Teiresias in the first episode belies the argument that the conflict in the *Bacchae* is one between the god Dionysus and the whole of the city of Thebes. Cadmus hails from the palace, Teiresias from the city. But the remarkable thing about these two characters in the play is that they do not represent any of the forces which emanate from one of the areas beyond the stage. They are the only characters in the play who act strictly on their own personal account.[361] On the one hand the two of them are isolated in the face of the whole Kingdom of Thebes, since they are the only ones to assert Dionysus' divine existence and to pay him due honour (cf. 195-96, 366). On the other hand their relationship to the god is dubious, cf. p. 38. Even in the first scene (170-214), when they do not yet have to defend themselves against Pentheus, they produce well thought out arguments to explain their behaviour, and they are not affected by the Bacchic ecstasy (Cadmus: 181-83, Teiresias: 201-09). They cannot therefore be considered as representing the god, or Cithaeron, the area beyond the stage linked with him.

It is worth noting that the motives of the two old men boil down to a χρὴ χορεύειν, 'one must needs dance'. Both are driven by anxiety that a god should receive his due worship (191-97, 206-09), and that they, humans, should not try to be too clever for the god (199, 200). This supports Dodds' doubts about the correctness of the interpretation in which 'the scene should be played frankly to get laughs'. Naturally the first scene (up to Pentheus' entrance) was written so that the audience would be amused at the sight offered by the two old men playing at being bacchants, but the scene's effect was achieved by two conflicting moods: the amusement of the audience and the fear of the two old men. They are doing something which they must do; Dionysus frequently harks back to this 'must' in his sarcasm directed at Pentheus in the fourth episode (912, 924, 943, 948, 955, 964).

The absence of a relationship between Cadmus and Teiresias on the one hand, and the areas beyond the stage on the other, illustrates the special position that the two old men occupy in the plot of the play. Their conflict with the young king in the first episode serves to clarify the position of Pentheus and Thebes, and to strengthen the opinion of Pentheus

[361] In the exodos Cadmus is indeed connected with the (destroyed) palace.

and his advisers, that the recognition of the existence of the god Dionysus depends upon questionable motives involving theological and family politics. Their very age is an argument *e contrario* for the immoral character of Dionysus worship. The episode of Teiresias and Cadmus stands apart from any of the forces beyond the stage, cf. p. 50 and n. 229, for both of them are helpless and powerless in the collision on stage of forces emanating from the different areas beyond it. As not very credible representatives of Dionysus worship they see their mediation with Pentheus result in a fiasco, when Cadmus is chased away by him to the mountain (343-44), and the seat from which Teiresias declares the auspices is overthrown (346-50). As representatives of palace and city they are filled with fear. But their mediation with the god too: ἐξαιτώμεθα / ὑπέρ τε τούτου ... ὑπέρ τε πόλεως 361-62 (let us beseech him for this man and for the city) has predictably an equally negative result.

Pentheus and Thebes

The palace and the city are the two areas beyond the stage associated with the opposition to Dionysus worship, and there is growing tension between them about how they should act. This tension is put into words by Pentheus' servants: the soldier who has arrested the stranger (434 ff.) and the herdsman who comes to tell of the scenes outside the walls (660 ff.). From their inferior position both choose their words carefully. The soldier has seen signs of Dionysus' power (the stranger's smile when he is arrested, the women's escape from custody), and says about this prisoner: θαυμάτων ἥκει πλέως (he has come full of wonders), but formulates his criticism of the king more hesitatingly: σοὶ δὲ τἄλλα χρὴ μέλειν (but the rest is your business).

The herdsman has experienced more than the soldier, and uses stronger terms to describe Dionysus' influence: ὡς δεινὰ δρῶσι θαυμάτων τε κρείσσονα, 'they are doing things unheard of, greater than miracles', 667. When he has asked Pentheus' permission to speak (668-71) and has been granted it (672), he is outspoken in his criticism (οὐχ ὡς σὺ φῄς—not as you say) (686) and presses the need for a new policy (τὸν δαίμον' οὖν ... δέχου πόλει τῇδε—therefore receive this power into the city', 769 f.).

This new policy is rejected by Pentheus; the god is not to be received into the city, and the palace still has power over the city (780 ff., 809). But when, as events develop, Pentheus considers whether he should, in female clothing, accompany the stranger to look at the Theban bacchae, he does not wish to be seen going through the city, 840 καὶ πῶς δι' ἄστεως εἶμι Καδμείους λαθών; (and how shall I go through the city without the Cadmeians seeing me?) Apart from the embarrassment that Pentheus

feels at appearing in front of his citizens dressed in women's clothes (cf. 828), this secret journey of his to Cithaeron breaks the balance of power between palace and city, which had linked these two areas beyond the stage against Dionysus;[362] Pentheus will indeed not just wear female clothing, but carry the attributes of Dionysus worship: thyrsus and nebris (835). The predicted laughter of the Thebans at Pentheus[363] not only expresses their amusement over the king swathed in women's clothes, but splits the original unity of palace and city. We see therefore how in the area beyond the stage that represents the palace there is a shift in the direction of what is happening on Cithaeron; after the palace has itself become bacchic (576 ff.), he who represented this area on stage is stricken with Dionysiac mania. Pentheus as an object of ridicule to the citizens is the counterpart of Cadmus in Pentheus' eyes, when the king still had full possession of his senses (250, 322). In the person of Pentheus the split between palace and city is expressed by the king's observation that he sees two cities (919) and in his wish to be conducted openly through the city (961). Here too Euripides looks back to the situation in the scene between Cadmus and Teiresias, cf. 962-63 with 195-96:

Πε. μόνος γὰρ αὐτῶν εἰμ' ἀνὴρ τολμῶν τόδε.
Δι. μόνος σὺ πόλεως τῆσδ' ὑπερκάμνεις, μόνος.
~ Κα. μόνοι δὲ πόλεως Βακχίῳ χορεύσομεν;
Τε. μόνοι γὰρ εὖ φρονοῦμεν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι κακῶς.

(*Pe.*: I am the only man who dares do this / *Di.* You are the only one to bear the burden of this city, the only one. ~ *Ca.*: Are we the only ones of the city who will dance for the Bacchic one? / *Te.*: We are the only ones with sense, the others are all wrong.)

In the exodos the forces of the separate areas beyond the stage are resolved in the spectacular catastrophe of Pentheus, Agave, and Cadmus. The city is left merely as a setting for the action.[364] The battle between the palace and the mountain is ended. The scene in which

---

[362] The mise-en-scène perhaps prepared the ground for the break-down in the balance of power between the palace and the city by the scene after 810 being played with no other witnesses than the chorus. Until then Pentheus had been attended by his bodyguard (346, 352, 503, 509); but with 780: στεῖχ' ἐπ' Ἠλέκτρας ἰὼν / πύλας and 810 ἐκφέρετέ μοι δεῦρ' ὅπλα, only Pentheus and Dionysus are left on the stage.

[363] 854f.: χρῄζω δέ νιν γέλωτα Θηβαίοις ὀφλεῖν
γυναικόμορφον ἀγόμενον δι' ἄστεως.

[364] In the last scenes there is no sign of the city as a separate force, 1295 Κα. ἐμάνητε, πᾶσά τ' ἐξεβακχεύθη πόλις refers back naturally to the opening situation of the action, the women's involuntary βακχεία. Probably Dionysus, as deus ex machina, made pronouncements about the city too, cf. *Hypoth.* Διόνυσος δὲ ἐπιφανεὶς τὰ μὲν πᾶσι παρήγγειλεν, ἑκάστῳ δὲ κτλ.

Dionysus accomplished his bacchic miracles in the palace (576 ff.) has been countered by a scene in which the king leaves his palace and goes as a bacchant to the mountain. The spatial aspects of the two points of the action are counterparts to each other, and have cancelled out the contrasts between the areas.[365]

Function of space in the story nuclei of the plot

The treatment of space in the *Bacchae*, as outlined above, confirms what has been said in chapter 4 (p. 64) about the structure of the plot. In fact, from the treatment of space it seems that the *Bacchae* has indeed one theme, Dionysus' claim to the recognition of his divinity in Thebes, the town of his birth, but that the play contains two separate story nuclei which in the plot tend to be worked out first one, and then the other. The course of the *Bacchae*'s action is marked by three shifts in the treatment of space:

(1) to punish Thebes (palace and city) for its non-recognition of his divinity, and with the intention of revealing himself as a god, Dionysus has chased the women of Thebes out into the mountains (32 ff.);

(2) to free his Lydian followers from oppression, Dionysus makes

---

[365] Joerden *Diss.* 259-61 speaks in this connection of an 'Aufsaugung des einen Bereichs durch den gegnerischen'. He calls the *Bacchae* 'ein Reflex der Antigone des Sophokles', but in my opinion takes the correspondence between the *Bacchae* and the *Antigone* too far. Certainly there is a resemblance between the scenes of *Antigone* 432ff. and *Bacchae* 434ff.: the representative of the religious point of view is led onto the stage bound, the circumstances of the capture have some details in common. But the taking prisoner of a fearless and smiling Dionysus is a traditional theme that also occurs in the Homeric hymn (cf. p. 122), so that this part at least need not be any 'Sophocles-reflex'. A great difference, however, lies in the treatment of space, from which Joerden too reached his conclusions. (i) In the *Bacchae* the religious aspect of Dionysus has its own distinct area behind the stage, which is primarily characterized by mountains: distant mountains (Tmolus, Nysa, Olympus, Parnassus) and after 576 exclusively the nearby Mount Cithaeron. In the *Antigone* neither the sphere of religion nor the authority of Creon have such a distinct domain of their own; compare for instance the ambiguous attitude of the chorus. (ii) In the *Antigone*, therefore, the areas behind the stage display a purpose far less than they do in the *Bacchae*. The conflict (τί δράσω;) is confined entirely within the characters of the play, regardless of the areas with which they are connected: Antigone, Ismene, Creon and Haemon all belong to the sphere of the palace. On the other hand those points in the *Bacchae* which advance the action materially all have an external, a 'mechanical' character: the earthquake stops Pentheus' persecution of the stranger; the fact that Pentheus is deprived of his senses contains in itself the—bloody—solution to the conflict as the god himself states 851ff.: ὡς φρονῶν μὲν εὖ / οὐ μὴ θελήσει θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι στολήν, / ἔξω δ' ἐλαύνων τοῦ φρονεῖν ἐνδύσεται. (iii) In the *Antigone* Creon, in a political decision, bends before the power of religion. The catastrophe results from the tragic length of time that he needed to reach his decision. Again there is scarcely any spatial aspect in this. In the *Bacchae* Dionysus sits enthroned as *deus ex machina* triumphant over the palace, and Cadmus and Agave are driven away from Thebes. The power of religion is present in person on the winning side.

himself master of the palace, and reduces all the king's threats to a powerless opposition (576 ff.);

(3) to accomplish his first intention, Dionysus brings Pentheus to a state where he loses his senses, leads him dressed as a bacchant to Cithaeron, and has him dispatched (810 ff.).

The imprisonment of the stranger and his female companions (the chorus), the threats directed at them, and their liberation by the god, together form a story nucleus of liberation/escape, which forms a more or less independent entity in the play. This is seen from the treatment of the role of Pentheus. Pentheus is certainly disconcerted by the outcome of the liberation drama (642), but through the messenger speech which follows it he recovers his implacable attitude, and is on the point of armed intervention in the course of events (778 ff.). He originally intended to capture the women on Cithaeron, and throw them in irons (231-32): καὶ σφᾶς σιδηραῖς ἁρμόσας ἐν ἄρκυσιν / παύσω κακούργου τῆσδε βακχείας τάχα (and binding them in nets of iron, I will soon stop this evil revelry). The events on Cithaeron, particularly those in Hysiae and Erythrae, make him decide to take military instead of police action, 784 ff.: ἐπιστρατεύσομεν / βάκχαισιν· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ὑπερβάλλει τάδε, / εἰ πρὸς γυναικῶν πεισόμεσθ' ἃ πάσχομεν (we will go armed against the bacchae; for it goes beyond all bounds, if we are to suffer this).

Shortly afterwards (810) the action takes a new course, but this is not caused by acquired wisdom or by political considerations,[366] but merely by the mental derangement which the god suddenly inflicts on Pentheus. A second story nucleus informs that part of the play from 657 onwards, that of vengeance. Consequently we see in the Bacchae the development of two separate themes which are both connected with areas beyond the stage:

(a) Dionysus as the Lydian stranger with his thiasos has come to Thebes, where he now is, from distant space;

(b) the Theban women in bacchic frenzy are chased out of the city and into the mountains.

After the prologue Euripides develops both themes concurrently, (a) the arrival of the Lydian stranger (233-47, 352-57) and (b) the escape of the Theban women to the mountains (215-32). Subsequently, after the first episode, (a) is developed further almost exclusively,[367] until the liberation drama is complete. At this point (657) (b) is taken up again, and the drama of divine vengeance is fulfilled. The cause of each drama

---

[366] The contrast with Creon in the *Antigone* is particularly great here.

[367] The dramaturgy of 443-48 is striking. The miraculous escape of the Theban women whom Pentheus had imprisoned is spatially connected with (b), but is integrated in the drama of liberation of (a).

is embedded in the other: the liberation drama becomes necessary because Pentheus imprisons the stranger out of his concern about the Theban women in the mountains;[368] the drama of divine vengeance, because Dionysus' mission to Thebes threatens to end in failure;[369] both are linked in that the same representatives of forces, Dionysus and Pentheus, are the protagonists. The supporting cast in each case is different: for the liberation drama the Lydian bacchae are in the front of the stage, in the vengeance drama it is the Theban women on Cithaeron who are the instrument of divine vengeance. Finally the treatment of space in the two plots produces a mirror effect in the sense that the liberation drama culminates in the translation of Dionysus to the palace, and that of divine vengeance in the translation of Pentheus to the mountain.

At the beginning of this chapter it was remarked (p. 143) that the action which was played out on the stage was strictly limited in its effects by the spoken word. It appears that in the *Bacchae* Euripides has in fact tried to make the theatre as much as possible a place for deeds as well. The culminating point of the liberation drama, the palace miracles, is spectacularly shown to the audience; in the drama of vengeance the audience see with their own eyes how Pentheus is gradually deprived of his senses by the god, and how Agave, with her son's head in her hands (1280), comes to her senses again.

The chorus

The relationship between the appearance of the chorus and the action is studied in chapter 10. A brief comment is called for on the relationship of the chorus to the space in the *Bacchae*.

The course of the Bacchae's action is fixed by the three shifts mentioned previously in the treatment of space (cf. p. 152): the removal of the maddened Theban women to Cithaeron; the occupation of the palace by Dionysus; and the translation of Pentheus, who has been driven mad, from the palace to Cithaeron for his sparagmos. This treatment is reflected in the choruses: the departure of the Theban women is followed by the incursion into Thebes of women from Lydia, who call upon the city to worship Dionysus (64-169); the liberation drama in the *Bacchae* is sealed by the chorus invoking the god in their song to come from distant space to Thebes to free his thiasos from the grip of oppression (557-75);

---

[368] Cf. 233-41 and 352ff.: ἐξιχνεύσατε / τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον, ὃς ἐσφέρει νόσον / καινὴν γυναιξὶ ... ὡς ἂν ... / θάνῃ.

[369] Dionysus links the liberation drama more directly to his vengeance, 856: τεισώμεθ' αὐτόν, ... / ἐκ τῶν ἀπειλῶν τῶν πρίν, αἷσι δεινὸς ἦν.

and the fulfilment of the divine vengeance is portrayed in the chorus' vision of Pentheus' journey to Cithaeron (977-96), in the prayer to the god to appear as a bull, a snake, or a lion, and to cast his deadly net round Pentheus with a smile (1018-23), and in the dance of joy for Agave and her gruesome prize (1153-64).

CHAPTER TEN

THE CHORUS IN THE ACTION: WHAT IS WISDOM?

From a structural point of view there are two genres of choric song in tragedy: the antistrophic and the astrophic choral lyric. The relation between the astrophic lyrics and the action on the stage is very close; the astrophic lyric is part of the action, in which the chorus partly reacts, and partly acts itself. This is categorised by Jürgen Rode in his study of choric song[370] as 'mimetic'; in fact the astrophic lyrics are not lyrics in the proper sense of the word, but 'schnelle, ausdrucksbetonte, oft durch Chorteilung zerrissene, aktionsabhängige lyrische Gebilde'. In the *Bacchae* there is one astrophic lyric, 1153-64, which takes the place of the fifth stasimon: the chorus' dance of joy at Agave's return to the city, after she has celebrated on Cithaeron the most gruesome oreibasia that can be imagined.

More problematical is the relationship between the action and the antistrophic lyrics, which make up by far the majority of tragic choruses. Rode is too dogmatic in imposing on Euripides a division into two periods. In his first period, between the years 438 and 420, the Euripidean chorus is for him a 'Szenenreflex':[371] 'Eine gedankliche Weiterentwicklung oder Kontrastierung der Handlung bringen diese Lieder nicht; sie sind nicht nur unselbständig, sondern auch eindeutig der Szene untergeordnet. Man konnte sie "enklitisch" nennen.' He calls the later choruses of Euripides[372] 'Programmlied': 'Der Eindruck des genuin Liedmässigen, des Musikalischen dominiert. Während das Chorlied ursprünglich selbständig mit gleichen Inhalt neben dem Sprechvers stand, dann, integriert, die Handlung gedanklich fortführte, ergänzte, sie dem Zuschauer in ihrer Ambivalenz sichtbar machte oder auch nur wiederspiegelte, ist es hier fast wieder zum selbständigen Lied geworden und — im Gegensatz zur frühen Zeit — zugleich aus dem eigentlichen Drama herausgetreten. Vornehmliche Aufgabe des Chors ist nicht mehr, die Handlung zu ergänzen usw., sondern, wie gesagt, Lieder zu singen'.

In various places (cf. p. 108, p. 109 n. 79, p. 112) Rode certainly recognizes that the choruses in Euripides' later work are not always merely 'incidental music', but he ignores too much the other functions of

---

[370] *Das Chorlied* in W. Jens ed., *Bauformen* 94. He gives a summary of the recent literature on p. 85f., n. 1.

[371] *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Heracl.*, *Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *Supp.* See Rode p. 108f.

[372] *Her.* and all plays from *Tro.* (415) to *Bacchae* and *IA*. See Rode p. 111ff.

the later choruses in his statement (p. 112) that the decisive characteristic for the audience was that at this point a song was sung. Particularly in the *Ion* and the *Bacchae* the chorus is not made up of a group of chance passers-by, but of people who are closely linked with one of the chief characters in the play; their lines by their content give evidence of involvement in the scene which is being played, and in the actions of, and actions against, the character with whom they are linked.

Consequently in the *Bacchae* the parodos introduces the subject of the dramatic conflict in the action, not only, and not so much, in the astrophic pro-oimion (64-72) but particularly in the second strophe (105-19), because the chorus use the split caused by Dionysus between the men and the women of Thebes to call upon the city to worship him.[373] Secondly, it has been shown (p. 134) that the parodos performs the function of presenting the orgiastic cult to the audience in clear outlines as the norm, as the back-cloth against which the events of the plot will be played out. This function therefore exceeds that of a 'Programmlied' or even of a 'Szenenreflex': here the choral lyric serves rather as 'Mittel des Kalküls'.[374] The first stasimon following it is not only an 'incidental song' about clever thinking as opposed to Dionysiac wisdom, but also a reflection on the inhospitable reception of the stranger and his thiasos in Thebes, where beauty and loveliness seem to be taboo; therefore the chorus long for Cyprus, Egypt, and Pieria. The second stasimon is originally 'enclitic', a reflection upon the scene played: the marching off of the stranger to prison (519-22); but after that the chorus is much more closely integrated with the action, because the call for help (553-55) and the invocatory hymn of the epode (556-75) are answered by the god with his appearance in Thebes. The strophe of the fourth stasimon (977-96) also shows this kind of strong integration with the action, when the chorus, after the departure of Pentheus and Dionysus, transport the audience to Cithaeron, and in a vision describe the events which at that moment of the action are being enacted beyond our sight. There is a second invocatory hymn in the epode of this stasimon; this time the god is invok-

---

[373] Rode (p. 112) sees *Bacchae* 73-169, among other things, as a song standing on its own, with a 'ganz algemeine Bezugnahme' on the actual action. He comments in a note (n. 86): 'Konkretere Bezugnahme allerdings in dem astrophischen Vorspruch, V. 64-72'.

[374] For the chorus 'als Mittel des Kalküls' see Rode p. 105ff. According to the author this type of chorus is primarily Sophocles' domain, although it is true that Euripides too has entered it (Rode lists, inter alia, *Bacchae* 519-75), 'ohne dass allerdings die Sophokleische Meisterschaft erreicht würde' (p. 108). But probably no surviving Greek tragedy can rival our play, in which the ambivalence of the chorus' pronouncements (see Rode p. 106) has been more effective in bringing out the irony of the action for the audience, both the ambivalence of their pronouncements about the Dionysiac rites (see chapter 8), and those about the Dionysiac attitude to life: τὸ σοφὸν οὐ σοφία (see chapter 6 and below).

ed to appear as bull, snake or lion, and, smilingly, to throw his deadly net round Pentheus (1018-23). The only stasimon in the *Bacchae* that can with any justification be called an 'incidental' one is the third, although even then it can be said that both the strophe: the hind who escapes her hunters (862-76), and the antistrophe: the certainty of god's vengeance (882-96), are reflections on the previous scenes; or, more accurately, reflections on the two dramas with different story nuclei within the *Bacchae*, the drama of liberation/escape, and the drama of divine vengeance, which in this stasimon have been linked together by the poet with the refrain: τί τὸ σοφόν; 'what is clever thinking?' (877-81 = 897-901) as if this refrain were the anchorage for all the events of the play.

Apart from the choruses Euripides wrote three amoibaia (sung dialogues) for the *Bacchae*; the chorus take part in all three. In the first amoibaion (576-603) the god frees the stranger and his thiasos from Pentheus' oppressive grip; in the second (1024-42) the news arrives that the god has accomplished his vengeance; in the third (1168-99) the god's triumph and Agave's madness are measured out.[375]

So in the amoibaia of the *Bacchae* too, the chorus are very tightly linked with the action. In the depiction of the plot, both in the completion of the liberation drama, and in the execution of the drama of divine vengeance, Euripides has assigned an important task to the chorus.[376] This does not

---

[375] The god's amoibaion with the chorus (576-603) is astrophic and strongly mimetic. Qua form it is characteristic of some amoibaia from the last period of 5th-century tragedy, cf. Hansjürgen Popp, *Das Amoibaion*, in W. Jens, ed., *Bauformen* 273, in the lack of a formal structure for a purely lyrical (that is to say not epirrhematic) and polymetric system. The absence of dochmiacs in such an amoibaion is surprising: the structure of dactyls, trochees, and cretics (paeons) is in my opinion a reflex on the epode in the parodos, that is to say on the epiphanic character of the events described, cf. n. 337. The second amoibaion (1024-42) is a typical Euripidean epirrhematikon, cf. Popp p. 261. The last amoibaion (1168-99) is, after the chorus' ecstasy over the death of Pentheus (1153-64), above all a demonstration of Agave's madness (cf. Popp p. 267). Agave sings the greatest part of it, while the chorus reacts to the sight of a mother bearing the head of her son. For the combination of dochmiacs and dactylic epitrites (cf. 1018-22) see Barrett ad *Hipp.* 1268-81.

Text: 1168 Αγ. Ἀσιάδες βάκχαι—Χο. τί μ' ὀροθύνεις, ὦ; This text is based on an emendation of Hermann's for τί με ὀρθεῖς ὦ; P. But the epicism ὀροθύνειν does not occur in Euripides elsewhere; moreover, one would expect some reaction from the chorus to Agave's striking Ἀσιάδες βάκχαι. I prefer Fix's suggestion, which is also more obvious palaeographically: θροεῖς (ΟΡΘ- for ΘΡΟ-). I suggest reading: τί με θροεῖς, ὦ ὦ; For ὦ ὦ cf. Soph. *OC*. 224, *Fr.* 314.67 (ὠώ (?) see Radt ad loc.) and LSJ s.v. in fine. 1174 and 1190 seem to me beyond recovery.

[376] D. W. Lucas is incorrect in his version of events, inspired by the frequently discussed rules set out by Aristotle for the function of the chorus, *Poet.* 1456 a 25: καὶ τὸν χορὸν δὲ ἕνα δεῖ ὑπολαμβάνειν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, καὶ μόριον εἶναι τοῦ ὅλου καὶ συναγωνίζεσθαι μὴ ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδῃ ἀλλ' ὥσπερ Σοφοκλεῖ. Lucas, commenting on the *Bacchae,* remarks: 'Even in the *Bacchae*, where the Chorus is of vital importance in presenting the Dionysiac faith, the actors ignore their presence and their comments except in two short passages in which a single actor is alone on the stage with the chorus'. But (i) the choruses in the *Bacchae* play a

mean that the chorus can be classed as a character in the play;[377] on the contrary the performance of the chorus differs in kind from that of the characters. Naturally the chorus ventilate certain opinions (see for example both antistrophes of the first stasimon) and make their pronouncements from a dramatic perspective assigned to them by the poet; but above all the chorus interpret moods which, at least in the *Bacchae*, are strictly functional in the action, that is to say they make up a part of the impressions which the audience receives during the performance, and through which the plot is represented (cf. p. 22 f.). So we see in the *Bacchae* that the drama of liberation/escape is reflected in the choric odes in the mood of escape interpreted by the chorus: 370-85 (freedom from care), 402-16 (escape), 553-57 (call for liberation), 862-76 (song of freedom); and that the drama of divine vengeance is reflected in the chorus' feelings of revenge: 877-901 (the certainty of divine punishment), 977-1016 (the destruction of the adversary), 1018-23 (call for vengeance), 1153-64 (song of vengeance).

Besides the direct participation of the chorus in the action in the mimetic amoibaia, and in the last stasimon which is equally mimetic, a strong relationship can be observed between the remaining choruses and the action both in the reflections which they offer on the scenes played and in the description of events which the chorus hope for, expect, or suggest as future developments of the plot. We can assume a second relationship, one much more difficult to demonstrate, between the views expressed in the choruses, and the conceptual aspects of meaning of the action. In this second relationship the question about 'clever thinking' seems to be of overriding significance, because in the first place the chorus repeatedly declare themselves to be opponents of τὸ σοφόν, and secondly the word σοφός has been used in the action of the play particularly about Dionysus/the stranger (and in the first episode about Teiresias). The question of what τὸ σοφόν means in the *Bacchae* must be examined; the conceptual aspect of its meaning will be dealt with in the last chapter.

τί τὸ σοφόν;

Recent contributions have been made to the question of the meaning and the context of τὸ σοφόν in the *Bacchae* by C. W. Willink (II 229-31, 235-37), R. P. Winnington-Ingram (BICS 13 (1966) 34-37), D. J.

strikingly active role in the action, see particularly 553-75, 977-90, 1018-22, 1153-64; (ii) Pentheus, at the culminating point of his measures to put down the worship of Dionysus, does indeed take notice of the chorus, 511-14; (iii) there are not two, but three dialogues between the chorus and characters in the play, 576-617, 1029-42, 1165-1201. Of these neither the first nor the third can be called short.

[377] Cf. Rode, *Das Chorlied* p. 114f. and his note 100.

Conacher (*Euripidean Drama* (1967) 73-77) and Marilyn Arthur (Yale Classical Studies 22 (1972) 172-79). We can perhaps dismiss the solution proposed by Miss Arthur. In it she suggests (p. 179) 'that the chorus exalt τὸ σοφόν throughout the play and that the rejected value in line 395 must therefore be σοφία': first because in τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία (395) it would be unacceptable from any point of view if the chorus were to classify the idea τὸ σοφὸν as positive by opposing to it a generally positive idea (σοφία) used in this context only in a negative sense, and about whose objectionableness nothing more is said in the play; in fact this is the only place in the *Bacchae* where the word σοφία is used;—secondly because the negative tone of τὸ σοφόν in Teiresias' speech (203) is ascribed by Miss Arthur to the ambiguous position of the seer—however, if this were the case the poet, rather than showing Teiresias as ambiguous, would, by introducing a contradictory meaning for τὸ σοφόν, have made his text incomprehensible to the audience.

Euripides speaks of τὸ σοφόν in four places: 203, 395, 877 = 897, 1005. It has rightly been remarked by both Willink and Conacher that in interpreting the play one must take account of the meaning of σοφός wherever it appears. It is evident that in 203 and 395 the tone of τὸ σοφόν is negative: Teiresias and the chorus attack 'clever thinking' (cf. Willink 230, n. 3, who seeks an equivalent in the word 'braininess') as against σοφία which lies in the area of εὖ φρονεῖν (common sense), cf. 196, 199, 387, 390, and σωφροσύνη (being sensible), cf. 328, 504, 1002 versus corruptus, 1150, 1341). τὸ σοφόν and σοφία are contrasted, implicitly by Teiresias (200-09) and explicitly by the chorus as τὰ μεγάλα διώκειν (pursuing great things) as opposed to τὰ παρόντα φέρειν (accepting everyday reality). One typically Dionysiac aspect of this last idea is repeatedly mentioned by the chorus: εὐαίωνα διαζῆν 426 (a life of happiness), τὸ δὲ κατ' ἦμαρ ὅτῳ βίοτος / εὐδαίμων, μακαρίζω 910-11 (blessed is he, say I, who is happy from day to day), βροτείως τ' ἔχειν ἄλυπος βίος 1004 (to behave as a mortal means a life free of grief). We meet another aspect of τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν (right thinking) in the refrain of the third stasimon 877-81 = 897-901.

Is the question τί τὸ σοφόν; in 877 (a) a 'genuine question' or (b) a 'contemptuous rejection'? Winnington-Ingram, who discusses the problem along these lines in the article mentioned above, opted for (b), in contrast to his earlier *Euripides and Dionysus* (p. 68, 107 f.) when he opted for (a). In the BICS article he writes: 'there is a slight probability that τὸ σοφόν at 877 has the same reference as to 203, 395 and 1005, i.e. that it means wisdom or cleverness in the conventional sense—and that, accordingly, τί τὸ σοφόν; is a formula of rejection'. From a slightly different point of view Willink suggests that the chorus' attitude with respect to τὸ σοφόν

'develops dynamically during the course of the drama'; he further suggests that 'the message of the *Bacchae* is not that τὸ σοφόν is *bad*—rather that it is valuable but inadequate, and not to be equated with true σοφία.' The contrast between these ideas is not in fact as great as it appears to be, and both Winnington-Ingram and Willink seem to be on the right lines in their interpretation of τὸ σοφόν.

It is certainly the case that Teiresias and the chorus reject τὸ σοφόν as the attitude to life of κακόβουλοι (men of evil counsel), but they speak from the dramatic perspective that has been given them by the poet. For Euripides' public the word τὸ σοφόν, like the word σοφός, which is in all respects ambiguous, gets a negative or positive loading from the context in which the word is used. And it is just the ambiguity of σοφός which seems to be of crucial importance for the action of the play, as we can establish from the lines with which the drama of liberation ends, and when the unfolding of the god's revenge is about to begin, 655-56:

Πε. σοφὸς σοφὸς σύ, πλὴν ἃ δεῖ σ' εἶναι σοφόν.
Δι. ἃ δεῖ μάλιστα, ταῦτ' ἔγωγ' ἔφυν σοφός.

(*Pe.* Clever—clever, except where you need to be wise!
Di. Particularly where it is necessary, that is where I'm wise.)

In Pentheus' mouth σοφὸς σοφὸς σύ is intended negatively: '(too) clever', whereas in the second half of the line the king gives the word the positive meaning of 'wise, sensible'. In his reply the stranger seizes on this second positive meaning, which he, οὐκ ἐνσοφιζόμενος τοῖσι δαίμοσιν (not chopping logic with the gods), cf. 200, gives the same religious overtones which the chorus had linked to σοφός in 395 and 427.[378] However, it is not likely that the audience would have understood 656 only as an adept of Dionysus humbly professing his belief, since they know that this zealot is the god himself. In 656 therefore the audience hear the god's answer as sarcasm: 'On the contrary, I am much more clever than you think'. In this sarcasm is concealed the god's threat that he will use his own particular cleverness (ταῦτ' ἔγωγ' ἔφυν σοφός) in some way that he has not yet done against Pentheus. The rest of the episode shows how this is done by a cleverness and a knowledge that is too powerful for any mortal: madness, and when once Pentheus has reached this stage, he appears to be all admiration: ὡς τις εἶ πάλαι σοφός 824 (How clever you have been all along.)

When the chorus in the next stasimon poses the question: τί τὸ σοφόν; they still link to τὸ σοφόν the negative meaning of 395. I do not believe that Willink is right in his remark (p. 230): 'the Chorus are themselves

[378] For the meaning of σοφάν in 427, see n. 270.

puzzled by the shifting meanings of the word σοφός'. But the question τί τὸ σοφόν; is again relevant for the scenes which have just been played, that is to say for the drama of divine vengeance which is now being accomplished. It is essential to bear in mind that the chorus think in black and white; they only see two attitudes to life: τὸ σοφόν (= τὸ μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν = τὰ μεγάλα διώκειν) (= thinking beyond the bounds of mortality = pursuing great things) and σοφία (= τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν = τὰ παρόντα φέρειν) (= right thinking = accepting everyday reality). In the first stasimon the chorus turned to a mood of anxiety, and desire for escape; in agreement with this the Dionysiac σοφία is described by them in terms of τὰ παρόντα φέρειν, εὐαίωνα διαζῆν (accepting everyday reality, living a life of happiness) and δέχεσθαι ὅ τι τὸ πλῆθος τὸ φαυλότερον ἐνόμισε χρῆταί τε (accepting what the common people think and do). At the same time they looked at the reverse side of this Dionysiac σοφία: μισεῖ (sc. ὁ Διὸς παῖς) ᾧ μὴ ταῦτα μέλει (he (the son of Zeus) hates the man who does not care for these things). Now, in the third stasimon, Dionysus has given this hate visible form in Pentheus' madness, and again the chorus sing of σοφία:

τί τὸ σοφόν; ἢ τί τὸ κάλλιον
παρὰ θεῶν γέρας ἐν βροτοῖς
ἢ χεῖρ' ὑπὲρ κορυφᾶς
τῶν ἐχθρῶν κρείσσω κατέχειν;
ὅ τι καλὸν φίλον ἀεί.

It is necessary to retain τὸ κάλλιον (the article is omitted by Paley, Dodds, Verdenius, Willink). In the first place there is no metrical argument against τὸ κάλλιον—Wilamowitz retains it (*Versk.* 259), Miss Dale commands (LM 148): 'on no account to be emended'. In the second place it is a question of choice between two things: τὸ σοφόν and σοφία. The question about τὸ σοφόν is indirectly answered by defining the alternative, Dionysiac wisdom, more exactly: 'What is clever thinking? Or (in other words) which is (of clever thinking and of Dionysiac wisdom) the most beautiful gift of the gods in men's judgement: (clever thinking) or [that is to say what is the more beautiful gift ...THAN] with a more powerful arm to keep down his enemies? And what is beautiful is always desirable.'

The choice between 'genuine question' and 'contemptuous rejection' with regard to τί τὸ σοφόν; does not therefore have to be made. The chorus certainly reject τὸ σοφόν, but put the question no less sincerely: it is a question which in a sense dominates the play. So far as the audience are concerned (and they understand the significance of the word σοφός in both senses), the action of the play demands an answer to this question from the chorus in the light of their previously expressed opinions, now

that the god has revealed his cleverness to the full. That the question: τί τὸ σοφόν; is not exclusively 'contemptuous rejection' is also apparent from the fact that the chorus implicitly consider τὸ σοφόν as a gift—albeit a lesser one—from the gods, just as in the previous passage both Teiresias and the chorus had presented τὸ σοφόν as something not entirely bad (the seer spoke of δι' ἄκρων φρενῶν 203 (deep thoughts), the chorus of μεγάλα διώκων 398 (pursuing great things)), but reproached it for a lack of wisdom and thoughtlessness, measured by the mortality of man and compared with the gifts of Dionysus. The chorus do not here outline Dionysiac wisdom by its escapist aspects (wine as a tranquillizer 378-85) and acceptance of the reality surrounding us, but by its aggressive qualities which are also linked with τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν (right thinking), and which no less than εὐαίωνα διαζῆν (the life of happiness), contain an idea that had been popular in Greek thought since archaic times: τὸ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα ἑκάστῳ ἀποδιδόναι δίκαιόν ἐστι (right is repaying their deserts to everyone) which is supposed to have been said by Simonides, according to Plato (*Resp.* 331 e); a pronouncement on which Socrates made the ironic comment (cf. Adam ad loc.): ἀλλὰ μέντοι, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, Σιμωνίδῃ γε οὐ ῥᾴδιον ἀπιστεῖν· σοφὸς γὰρ καὶ θεῖος ἀνήρ (but none the less, in my opinion, it is not easy to disagree with Simonides, for he was a wise and godly man). Alcmene in the *Heraclidae* (881, as quoted by both Dodds and Winnington-Ingram (1966) p. 36) says: 'Not to obtain your rights from your enemy is not wise'; and Archilochus *Fr.* 126 W. describes this wisdom: ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα, / τὸν κακῶς μ' ἔρδοντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς (one great thing I know, how to repay him who harms me with more harm), cf. *Fr.* 23 W. = P. Oxy. 2310 fr. 1 col. i. 14-15.

But with this more exact and more aggressively defined description of Dionysiac wisdom it is all the more remarkable that the chorus gives no direct answer to the question τί τὸ σοφόν; Apart from the fairly vague indication of μεγάλα διώκων 398 (pursuing great things) and the equally ambiguous idea of περισσόν 429 (superior), the chorus talk of τὸ σοφόν in terms which say what τὸ σοφόν is not, rather than what it in fact is: ἀχάλινα στόματα (unbridled mouths) and ἄνομος ἀφροσύνη (lawless folly) 386-87, τὸ μὴ θνητὰ φρονεῖν (thinking beyond the bounds of mortality) 396, μαινομένων τρόποι (the ways of madmen) 400, κακοβουλία (evil counsel) 401, ἀμέλεια τοῦ εὐαίωνα διαζῆν (indifference to the life of happiness) 424-26, ἀγνωμοσύνη (arrogance) 885, μὴ τὰ θεῶν αὔξειν (not honouring the divine) 886. Moreover, it is clear in the action of the play that such terms are in general not applicable to Pentheus: the king in fact follows the reasoning of common sense (just as his mother and her sisters had done), when on his return from a journey abroad he learns that the Theban women have left the city and are living on Cithaeron in the com-

pany of a seductive Lydian. Furthermore he is a man of traditional piety (cf. 45-46, 467) and with an equally traditional sense of justice (cf. 246-47, 778-86, 1308-12, 1320-22). When the chorus categorize Pentheus as ἄθεον, ἄνομον, ἄδικον (atheist, lawless, unjust) (995 = 1015), these descriptions can only be justified within the limited perspective of Dionysus propaganda; outside that perspective it can only be said of Pentheus that he accepts reality as it is presented to him (τὰ παρόντα φέρει), and not that he fixes his gaze on unattainable distances (μεγάλα διώκει = μακρὰ παπταίνει, Pi. *I.*7.43-44, cf. p. 108), and would be better called φαυλότερος (ordinary) than περισσός (presumptuous) 429-431.

Therefore 395: τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία is not only a paradox conceptually, but it is a paradox *in the action*. In the action of the *Bacchae* the term τὸ σοφόν operates only as a term of Dionysiac propaganda, but it is not really applicable to the god's antagonists in this play. If one leaves aside for a moment the chorus' associations with τὸ σοφόν and asks the question: τί τὸ σοφόν; against the background of the meaning in the action of σοφία (wisdom) and σοφὸν εἶναι (to be wise), then clever thinking appears to be the crown of Dionysiac wisdom, on the human plane in Teiresias' reasoning (cf. 179, 186), but primarily on the divine plane in the actions of Dionysus (cf. 480, 656, 824, 1190 versus corruptus). When in the third stasimon the chorus ask the question: τί τὸ σοφόν; this question is not only an expression of arrogant rejection, but also a cry of triumph, and this time the vengeful feelings of the chorus may be paraphrased as: 'What is clever thinking? Or what cleverness is more beautiful than the wisdom of Dionysus, who brings his enemy low?' Probably Winnington-Ingram is wrong with the suggestion he puts forward (1966 p. 36) that the chorus 'rejects the suggestion (made by clever men) that there is anything more valuable than revenge'. The chorus indeed reject τὸ σοφόν and indeed they think revenge of more value, but the questions in 877-80 are not the terms of a syllogism. Naturally in the last instance it is the poet's irony which links τὸ σοφόν so closely to Dionysiac σοφία, but the conclusions which the audience draw from this belong to the conceptual aspect of meaning.

Finally it is worth remarking that the vengeful feelings which they glorify in this refrain are emphatically called καλόν (fine) by the chorus. It is perhaps not significant (contrary to Willink's view 231, n. 2) that the chorus use the word καλόν here for the first time. For the escapist aspect of the Dionysiac σοφία (εὐαίωνα διαζῆν) (the good life) does not expressly need this qualification, and the aggressive aspect, the desire for the destruction of their adversaries, does; but the use of the word καλός does seem to be significant here in that it is a reflection by the chorus on the previous episode. If my interpretation of 651-52 is correct (see Appendix

2), it was Dionysus who first called his vengeance καλόν. When Pentheus has been brought to a state where he loses his senses, he too calls the wisdom of his opponent καλόν, cf. 818 καλῶς γὰρ ἐξεῖπας τόδε, 'you said that finely', 826 πῶς οὖν γένοιτ' ἂν ἃ σύ με νουθετεῖς καλῶς; 'how, then, shall we put your fine advice into practice?' In the last stasimon the chorus, at the most gruesome point of the tragedy, and in the most bloody language, will again call the vengeance of Dionysus 'fine', 1163-64: καλὸς ἀγών, ἐν αἵματι στάζουσαν / χέρα περιβαλεῖν τέκνου (a fine ordeal, to embrace your child with an arm dripping with his blood), fascinated as they are by Dionysus καλλίνικος (the fine victor), cf. 1147, 1161.

Continuing along this line of interpretation, what do the chorus' words mean in 1005 ff., the fourth place where τὸ σοφόν is mentioned in the *Bacchae*?

Murray reads: τὸ σοφὸν οὐ φθονῶ· χαίρω θηρεύουσα· τὰ δ' ἕτερα μεγάλα φανερά τ'· (φθόνῳ P). Objections are: this construction is not used with φθονεῖν (+ dat.pers., + gen.rei; sometimes + dat.rei; in other cases + inf.[379]); χαίρω θηρεύουσα sc. τὸ σοφόν clashes with the chorus' previous pronouncements about τὸ σοφόν.

Dodds reads: τὸ σοφὸν οὐ φθονῶ· χαίρω θηρεύουσα τάδ' ἕτερα μεγάλα κτλ. Objections are to the construction of φθονεῖν as above, and that an adversative asyndeton is out of place after οὐ φθονῶ. Therefore Dodds sympathises with Headlam's further emendation to οὐ ζηλῶ, for the sense required here is τὸ σοφὸν οὐ μακαρίζω.

A better solution, then, is to keep to the reading of P: τὸ σοφὸν οὐ φθόνῳ χαίρω θηρεύουσα· and to take it to mean: 'I do not rejoice in pursuing, full of envy, clever thinking'. The wisdom of the chorus knows no envy; but clever thinking is denounced as a jealous state of mind, typical of a man like Pentheus.[380] Just as elsewhere (cf. p. 163 above) cleverness is only approached negatively, that is to say by a digression about the nature of its opposite, wisdom. In τὰ δ' ἕτερα, δέ is now not adversative, but causal; just as this can be seen in 877 from the article in τὸ κάλλιον γέρας (the finer boon), so it is apparent here from τὰ ἕτερα that in the chorus' view there are only two alternatives: the common sense of Pentheus and the The-

---

[379] *IT* 503 τί δὲ φθονεῖς τοῦτο; is no exception to the rule, since τοῦτο stands here for an infinitive λέγειν ποῖόν σοι ὄνομα ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο, or, perhaps rather γελᾶσθαι θανόντα.

[380] Pindar, in his description of the 'Dionysiac' attitude to life, says (cf. 108), *I.* 7.39ff.: ὁ δ' ἀθανάτων μὴ θρασσέτω φθόνος, ὅ τι τερπνὸν ἐφάμερον διώκων ἕκαλος ἔπειμι γῆρας ἔς τε τὸν μόρσιμον αἰῶνα. He who pursues great things arouses the jealousy of the gods, and he who supports clever thinking arouses the jealousy of Dionysus, cf. 424. By suggesting that Pentheus does in fact pursue, full of envy, clever thinking (and therefore meets his doom), the chorus are turning things upside down, although the audience may be well aware that Pentheus' punishment originates precisely from Dionysus' envy.

bans cannot be accommodated within the frame of Dionysiac propaganda. So the whole passage, 1005-010[381] should be compared with the refrain, which has already been discussed, 877-81: not clever thinking, but its counterpart, wisdom, is described—this time not in terms of vengeance (though μεγάλα καὶ φανερά, 'great and obvious things', appear again in 1198-99), but in terms of inner piety (cf. 74, 425-29). Both this inner piety and the chorus' desire for vengeance are based—within Dionysiac propaganda—upon τὰ δίκαια φρονεῖν, 'right thinking', and τὸ καλόν, 'beauty'.

---

[381] In 1007ff. the meaning of the chorus' words is certainly clear, but opinions differ about the text. The corruption is looked for in the words τῶν ἀεί—the emendations are legion, see Dodds. Willink suggests φανερά τ'· ὤνα< σεν τ'> ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ βιοῦν. J. Roux retains the text: τῶν ἀεὶ ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ (partitive genitive, for which she produces a supposed parallel from Sextus Empiricus). But the text is certainly corrupt, since, apart from the prosaic style, τὰ ἕτερα (or, in another reading, τάδ' ἕτερα) = τὰ ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ (sc. φέροντα) and not a part of it. The reconstruction of a form ἄγει or ἄγοντα is not so elegant; on the analogy of 424-29 (ταῦτα ...· ... διαζῆν ... ἀπέχειν) one would expect βίον to be the object of εὐσέβειν and ἀεὶ ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ to be the attribute of βίον. Obviously there is an article τόν missing from βίον, cf. the contrast: τὰ ἔξω νόμιμα δίκας (1009). I prefer to read:

τὸ σοφὸν οὐ φθόνῳ χαίρω θηρεύου- 2 δ
σα· τὰ δ' ἕτερα μεγάλα φανερά τε· τὸν ἀεὶ 2 δ ||
ἐπὶ τὰ καλὰ βίον ἦμαρ ἐς νύκτα τ' εὐ- 2 δ (Miss Dale LM 200 *n.* 1)
αγοῦντ' εὐσέβειν, τὰ δ' ἔξω νόμιμα 2 δ
δίκας ἐκβαλόντα τιμᾶν θεούς. 2 δ ||

'I do not rejoice in pursuing, full of envy, clever thinking; for there are other great and obvious things to aim for: to be pure and reverent, by day and into the night, in the sort of life that always leads to the beautiful, but, as to those customs that lie outside justice, to cast them out and honour the gods'. The correspondence between two shorts and one long (ὦ βάκχαι ~ τε τὸν ἀεί) is not unusual in dochmiacs. Otherwise one can also imagine: φανερά· τόν τ' ἀεί, in which τ' would look forward, not to τ' in 1008, but to δ' in 1009, cf. Denn. GP 513: 'The idea of contrast is added to the original idea of addition'.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

CONCEPTUAL MEANINGS

O, such a deed
As from the body of contraction plucks
The very soul, and sweet religion makes
A rhapsody of words.
Shakespeare, *Hamlet* 3.4.45-48

In the third chapter the conceptual aspect was distinguished as the fourth and last aspect of the audience's response to the action (p. 26 ff.). This aspect is concerned with the reasoned judgement of the audience about the action, and with its implication for their own reality outside the theatre. For the individual spectator this judgement is determined in part by subjective factors; his ability to set himself inside the dramatic reality of the play, and the problems of the play's characters; the way in which, in his judgement of the performance, he assimilates the emotions which it has aroused in him; and—particularly in the *Bacchae*—his own religious views. In describing the conceptual aspect of meaning, that is to say in describing the judgement towards which the poet invites his public, it was made conditional upon not being in conflict with the other three aspects. First therefore it is appropriate to gather together the main lines of the other three aspects appearing in earlier chapters.

The descriptive, participational and referential aspects of meaning

The action of the *Bacchae*, in the descriptive aspect of its meaning, describes to the audience how the god Dionysus reduces the rejection of his divinity by the city of Thebes and its king, Pentheus, to an act of human insignificance, and how he punishes this with the destructive effects of his ritual worship. Euripides develops these two aspects of the action following conventional story nuclei, that of liberation/escape, and that of divine vengeance. Among the god's opponents in Thebes are Semele's sisters and the king of the city, Pentheus, the chief victims of this destruction; it is caused by their refusal to reject what they see with their common sense as being the truth, and to accept as wisdom what they recognize as sophistry (30, 489). What seems to them natural and obvious (the cause of Semele's pregnancy, the reason for the presence of a beautiful Lydian in the mountains) appears in the course of the play to have been a misunderstanding with most terrible consequences (860-61, 1374-76). We get to know in the play about the reason for the first

misunderstanding (that concerning Semele), that Cadmus' motive for giving a supernatural explanation of his daughter's pregnancy was dictated by family pride, which shows little respect for the truth (cf. 334). On the other hand Semele's sisters saw what they considered to be the truth confirmed by the intervention of Zeus. The cause of the second misunderstanding, that concerning the stranger, is the subject of the action. The actions of the god appear to be a misleading and deceitful game, in which Pentheus is unable to see as false what he believes to be the truth. When the god wants to prevent the violence against his group of Theban women on Cithaeron, which his deception has made inevitable (cf. 780-85), he does so by seizing on the weapon at his disposal, that of madness (cf. 33, 305). In the action this weapon is not presented as the abandonment by the god of his ability to be σοφός, but as the crowning virtue of it (cf. 656, 1190); it is a trap into which Pentheus walks (848). When the plot begins, the Theban women have already been deprived of their sanity and are living on Cithaeron; Pentheus is overcome by madness in the course of the development of the plot. The god takes Pentheus in his madness to the women on Cithaeron, and in the sparagmos of the king which results from this, he reveals his divinity to Thebes. The fate of the children of Hysiae and Erythrae had already confronted the audience with the murderous nature of the Dionysiac rituals; this slaughter of the innocents is a prelude to the destruction of Pentheus, towards which the whole course of the action is directed. The king is, after all, the soul of Theban political and social life, and he is the central figure in the royal family (of which Dionysus is also a member): ᾧ δῶμ' ἀνέβλεφ'—ὃς συνεῖχες, ὦ τέκνον, / τοὐμὸν μέλαθρον (1308-09) (by whom the house recovered its sight,—who held together my house, my child). The deceit of the god, who pretends to be a stranger from Lydia, is directed towards the destruction of the king, as is seen in 508, cf. note 159.

The most prominent referential aspects of the *Bacchae*'s meaning are the depictions of Dionysus worship, maenadism, and the presentations of the god, both in his aspect of god of wisdom: the giver of wine and euphrosyne, the mentor of εὖ καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως ζῆν (living well and rightly and justly), and in that of god of madness: he who leads the dance, after his bloody rituals are accomplished; the god who, inspired by these rituals, makes streams of milk and honey flow (Pl. *Ion* 534 a: ὥσπερ αἱ βάκχαι ἀρύονται ἐκ τῶν ποταμῶν μέλι καὶ γάλα κατεχόμεναι, ἔμφρονες δὲ οὖσαι οὔ—just as the bacchae draw honey and milk for themselves from the rivers, which they do not do unless inspired) and who appears personally in divine shape. In the action of the *Bacchae* all these referential aspects of meaning are loaded with irony, because the mania of Dionysiac ecstasy does not in the play result in the joyful and

liberating appearance of the god to men, the prospect which in the parodos the chorus had held out to Thebes, but in the terrifying revelation of Dionysus' divinity by the bloody destruction of Thebes' political heart; and because in the two refrains in the *Bacchae*, 877-81 = 897-901 and 991-96 = 1011-16, the glorification (by the chorus) of Dionysiac wisdom is given its most remarkable expression when this destruction is described as 'beautiful' and 'just', καλόν and δίκαιον.

At the level of participational meaning the emotions of the audience are stirred in following the performance. It has been argued in chapter 3 (p. 25) that the description of this aspect is too closely linked to subjective factors to give reliable indications of how it affected the ancient spectator. Nevertheless we can describe the main outlines of the ἡδονή (pleasure) function of the tragedy on the basis of the descriptive and referential aspects. As a consequence it seems evident that the development of the plot in the liberation drama, particularly in the second episode (Pentheus' interrogation 453-518) has been written by the poet at least to some extent with the intention of entertaining his audience with the stranger's tricks and subtleties, and with the king's indignation and failure to understand. In the palace miracle scene (576 ff.), the theatrical portrayal, possibly strengthened by mechanical effects (cf. note 338) of the earthquake and of the suggestion in the chorus' behaviour of a divine manifestation, would certainly have surprised and bewildered the audience. In the plot in which the divine vengeance on Pentheus and Thebes is accomplished, the ἡδονή function is primarily directed at the arousal of pity and fear, of φόβος and ἔλεος. A start has already been given to this in the first episode, where in the appearance of the two old men, Cadmus and Teiresias, the comic aspects are mixed with their fear, and their knowledge that for them dancing on the mountain is not so much a matter of joy, but of survival (cf. p. 39, 149). In the second part of the play, the emotion of fear in the audience over the god's actions is increasingly intensified, until it reaches its peak in the sparagmos of Pentheus by his mother, who as priestess leads the slaughter (1114). In the exodos of the play, the audience's overruling emotion has become pity for Agave's miserable fate; this, often the emotion of the modern reader (cf. Dodds p. 219), was, according to Apsines (Rhet.Gr. IX p. 587 Walz), the emotion caused by Agave's appearance, and undoubtedly will also have been the emotion of Euripides' contemporaries. Just as is the case with the modern reader (cf. Dodds p. 222), the ancient spectator's pity probably resulted in his feeling some repugnance from the god's actions; and the poet added fuel to this repugnance by Cadmus' moving farewell speech to his grandson (1308-22), and by the desolate departure from Thebes of Agave, to whom not a single satisfaction (unlike Medea, Hecuba, Andro-

mache), not even a word of consolation (unlike Theseus in the *Hippolytus*, Heracles) is granted; and above all by the coldness of the affronted god, cf. 1350-51.

The choruses normally have of themselves a pronounced ἡδονή function. The parodos must have been a fascinating spectacle with its exotic, but—from the plastic arts—familiar presentation of maenads, with its raucous Phrygian music, its peculiar choreography (hopping, skipping and throwing back their heads), its transport into the epode with its racing rhythms. The stasima fall into two separate groups: the first three seem to be primarily an expression of the inner piety and the loveliness of the Dionysiac attitude to life; this is reflected in the clarity of the verse composition which consists almost entirely of ionic and aeolic cola (there are a few iambics mixed with the aeolic lines, 414-15 ~ 430-31, 875 ~ 895) and in the simplicity of the consecutive train of thought, cf. 370-401, 556-75, 902-11. The vengeance songs of the fourth and fifth stasima are in strong contrast to the previous choruses; Euripides uses their dochmiac metre in a remarkable way in the *Bacchae*: not to mark the chorus' fear or agitation, but their aggression, triumph, and joy.

But the choruses have a participational meaning not only in their function as songs, but in their relationship to the action, in that they give irony to the descriptive and referential aspects: the joy of Dionysus worship and of the god's manifestation is shown in the action to be joy at the sparagmos of Pentheus by his mother and the other Theban women; the attractive escapism of Dionysiac wisdom is shown in the action to give birth to a dehumanising cleverness. We must also look for this disclosure in the fact that the chorus call the vengeance on Pentheus καλόν (beautiful and δίκαιον (just). It is surely out of the question that Euripides' personal opinions in this area were diametrically opposed to those of Socrates, and that for Euripides the statement τὸ δὲ εὖ καὶ καλῶς καὶ δικαίως (sc. ζῆν) ὅτι ταὐτόν ἐστιν (to live well and beautifully and justly is the same) did not have much the same meaning as it had for example for Socrates and his circle.

The conceptual aspect of meaning

So we reach the conceptual aspect of meaning. One of the problems of this aspect is that we do not know how far the poet wished to communicate his personal vision of the events in his play to the audience. It is, after all, an obvious and justifiable interpretation of his task, and rightly so, for the tragic poet to compose the development of his plot in such a way, and give such a content to the ideas in the pronouncements of the chorus and of the characters in the play, that both the plot and the

ideas which he presents fulfil some purpose in the ἡδονή function of the play. So the principal, if not the exclusive purpose of a tragedy can be that the audience is entertained, moved and inspired by the beauty, terror, and charm of a fictional πρᾶξις (plot), which has its beginning, its course, and its completion within a space of two hours time.

On the other hand the fictional reality of the play refers continually to the existing reality of the poet and his public. In the last resort the poet in the creation of his plot interprets and portrays specific aspects of his own, and his time's, reality. This interpretation and portrayal in the *Bacchae* is not primarily a psychological one. The psychological explanation of the play, so often advocated, has proved not to be tenable in the light of the explanation of its descriptive aspect (chapters 4 and 5). It is also plain from this enquiry that the view of the *Bacchae* which has been predominant since Grube, Dodds, and Winnington-Ingram cannot be the correct one. For this view it is necessary to assume that Euripides in his play somehow ascribed to the god Dionysus the symbolic function of man's fundamental passions, of his emotional nature. But this is just what Dionysus in the *Bacchae* is not, except in the chorus' Dionysus propaganda. However, it also appears from the choruses, just as it does from the actions of the god himself, that the Dionysiac is not only sovereign in one extreme state of the human mind: madness, but also in its opposite: clever thinking.

Because these opposite poles are both loaded with the epithets καλόν (beautiful) and δίκαιον (right), it seems unlikely (cf. above p. 170) that Euripides in the *Bacchae* deliberately created the possibility that his audience should reach differing ideas about the action, though this could in theory have been the poet's intention at the conceptual level (see p. 28). On the contrary, the conceptual meaning of the *Bacchae*'s action must be sought in a sharply outlined philosophical interpretation and portrayal of reality by Euripides. This is implicit in the fact that the reality which the poet has portrayed in his play is permeated with the idea that things are not what they appear: the *Bacchae* is the last, and perhaps the most pessimistic variation on the antithesis ὄνομα—πρᾶγμα (ἔργον, σῶμα) (name—deed (thing, matter)) which the poet had learnt from the sophists, and which had fascinated him throughout his work. R. Kannicht's penetrating observations about the meaning of this antithesis in the *Helena* (*Einl.* 57 ff.) also enrich—mutatis mutandis—our insight into the ideas of the *Bacchae*; this play is at the opposite extreme to the *Helena* in the continuum from tragedy to comedy.

The ὄνομα-πρᾶγμα antithesis is defined in concrete terms in Teiresias' dogma of sophistry (διδάξω σε), 286-97. There one god misleads another with the εἴδωλον (image) of a third, and this deceitful operation is

precipitated among men as a μετάστασις ὀνομάτων (change of names) 296. Teiresias, who explains all this, is a true sophist: ὡς καλῶς ἔχει τόδε (how elegant this is) 287. This 'elegant' confusion between appearance and reality, between δόξα (appearance) and ἀλήθεια (truth), between the relative unimportance of what things are called (cf. Teiresias in 276) and the things themselves, governs the poet's portrayal of the dramatic reality at the conceptual level.

The starting point of the *Bacchae*'s action is the god's exchange (ἀντ-αλλαγή) of his divine shape for that of a stranger from Lydia. Among the Thebans this exchange causes a mistaken perception of reality, which is only removed in the anagnorisis, when the word ἀλήθεια (truth) is used for the first (and only) time in the play, 1287: *Ka.* δύστην' ἀλήθει', ὡς ἐν οὐ καιρῷ πάρει, 'unhappy truth, how untimely you appear!' On the other hand we find δόξα and δοκεῖν (seeming) used continually to describe the Theban notion of reality, in a pedantic sophistical way, by Teiresias (311-12, three times) and by the stranger (480), and with tragic irony by Pentheus himself, at the very point where Dionysus' divinity is revealed to him in his madness (918, 920).

The contrast between ὄνομα and πρᾶγμα is penetratingly illustrated in the *Bacchae* by the relative values of Dionysiac propaganda. 'Piety (Ὁσία), piety' cry the chorus (370), 'do you see Pentheus' impious hubris?' But as initiates of Dionysus worship the chorus say (113): ἀμφὶ δὲ νάρθηκας ὑβριστὰς ὁσιοῦσθε (be hallowed round the staffs of hubris). Within this worship μαίνεσθαι (to be mad) is both καλόν (beautiful) and δίκαιον (right) (33, 36, 130 etc.) and μαινάδες (maenads) is a title of honour, but at the same time Pentheus is fiercely attacked as a μαινόμενος (madman) 326, 359, 399, with a μαινομένᾳ δόξᾳ (mad judgement) 887, μανείσᾳ πραπίδι παρακόπῳ τε λήματι (with maddened mind and frenzied resolution) 999, and in the end he is jeered at by the god when he appears as a maenad (912-15). The adaptation of ὀνόματα in Dionysus propaganda for the benefit of their own objectives has its crowning point in τὸ σοφόν, σοφός and σοφία as has been explained in the previous chapter. Here the traditional antitheses between τὸ καλόν and τὸ αἰσχρόν (baseness), and between τὸ δίκαιον (right) and τὸ ἄδικον (wrong) become just a rhapsody of words, and only the τέλος (ends) of the god have an unambiguous content: τοιόνδ' ἀπέβη τόδε πρᾶγμα (so ends this matter) 1392.

We also meet this relative scale of values in the historical reality of Thucydides famous portrayal of the effects of civil war on the population, cf. 3.82.4: καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιώσει (and they changed the established meaning of words to fit their version of the facts). It can at first sight seem attractive to extend the

comparison with the historical reality pictured by Thucydides: Dionysus' arrival in his birthplace, Thebes, is also an example of στάσις (civil strife). Teiresias refers to the competitive position of Dionysus vis-a-vis Pentheus, 319-21. But Euripides was writing a tragedy, and one should certainly not go so far as to consider the *Bacchae* as an allegory of the contemporary political situation.[382]

In Euripides' dramatic presentation the ambivalence of values has a place in the god's actions, which can be described in terms of the Euripidean *mechanema* (cf. p. 32 f.) But in the *Bacchae* the *mechanema* has acquired a grim variant; it is not the cunning intrigues of mortals, who create an appearance in order to escape from the circumstances that threaten them, but it is the cleverness of a god, who creates an appearance, which will in the end destroy his adversaries. The most sinister feature of this unique *mechanema* is therefore that Τύχη (chance) plays no part in it. In the *Bacchae* there is neither suspense from fear lest human actions fail, nor is there the momentum of comedy in which everything will turn out right in the end thanks to Tyche. There is the certain knowledge that the god's design will be successful, and the action has a tragic momentum, showing how his design achieves this success. In it the god's search for vengeance cannot be stopped until it has also destroyed Cadmus and Agave.

It is the poet's concern in writing his play 'to enlarge our sensibility' as Dodds has rightly pointed out (*Introd.* xlvii). This enlargement of the audience's perceptions of the reality surrounding them can surely be best described in the sense given above, in which a sceptical, even pessimistic look at reality is suggested. Who or what Dionysus is in the spectators' own reality, how Euripides interpreted the god in the world of his own imagination, is a question to which Euripides himself might not have wished to give an answer within the frame of an interpretation of his work:[383] we have the god on his stage, and that must be enough. When people, cost what may, seek an answer to this question, perhaps—δόξαν λέγω—Winnington-Ingram comes closest to the poet's feelings about the god Dionysus. In his *Euripides and Dionysus* (p. 171-79) he comments emphatically on the group nature of Dionysiac ecstasy. Certainly Euripides

---

[382] Jean Carrière, *Sur le message des Bacchantes*, AC 35 (1966) 118-39, has done this. According to him the poet wanted to warn Athens against Alcibiades, p. 134f.: 'dans cette pièce, Penthée est l'ordre de la Cité, le pouvoir légal, rigoureux, sévère, jaloux de ses droits légitimes; Dionysos (Alcibiade) est l'ambition égoïste, aventurière, qui les piétine et les étouffe; les Bacchantes sont la multitude aveugle qui fait triompher l'aventure et prépare la catastrophe'. A critical rebuttal of Carrière's theory can be found in Rafaello Cantarella, *Dioniso, fra Baccanti e Rane*, Serta Turyniana (London 1974) 291-310.

[383] Cf. Fernand Chapouthier, *Euripide et l'accueil du divin*. Entretiens Fondation Hardt 1 (1952) 214: 'Ce chemin, où l'ironie joue à fleur du divin, conduirait aisément à l'agnosticisme, voire au pessimisme'.

saw this 'group nature' primarily in a social and political sense, and studied it in the heart of the polis and of the political system, not on the mountain slopes. In the reality of the world outside the theatre Euripides may perhaps have felt this divine power working in the group that possessed the attraction of a common attitude to life, that was defined by the ἡσυχίας βίοτος (quiet life, 390) and the εὐαίωνα διαζῆν (life of happiness, 426) and that knew the fascinating bliss of a mutually experienced ecstasy. But the real powers of such a group can be seen, not when they seek peace with the help of the various escapist techniques they have developed (wine, ritual worship, utopias in an earthly paradise of the Erotes or of the Muses), but when they assert themselves and try to impose their will on someone else. Then the genius of this group system appears; traditional popular wisdom and piety acquire an irresistible power to exclude and to destroy supposed or real adversaries. Then it is shown to be a closed system, in which everything has its place and in which language is stripped completely of its meaning.

If this was Euripides' attitude to Dionysus, what was his attitude to Pentheus? The poet has omitted everything which might give Pentheus the grandeur of a tragic hero. Pentheus is ordinary, φαῦλος, down to the smallest details. Even the portrait which Cadmus gives of Pentheus (1308-22), in which he paints the δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) of his grandson, and in which he protests against the god's depersonalization of his victim (cf. p. 98) also reveals a trait of the (typical) Theban tyrant who is apprehensive for his own and his family's prestige: πόλει τε τάρβος ἦσθα ('you were a terror to the city; 1309, cf. Appendix 1, p. 176). In his lack of understanding and trusting only in his own common sense, he is defenceless against the techniques of Dionysus and his worship.

It is a device of the average reader, and one used in his own interests, when he meets any literary work, however pessimistic, to look for grounds of consolation. In the *Bacchae* these grounds, assuming they are present at all, must rather be sought in Pentheus than in any aspect of Dionysus worship. In the passage from Thucydides referred to earlier about the effects of στάσις on the morality of citizens, the historian writes, 3.82.7: ῥᾷον δ' οἱ πολλοὶ κακοῦργοι ὄντες δεξιοὶ κέκληνται ἢ ἀμαθεῖς ἀγαθοί. I take the sense to be: 'Most people would rather be called smart because of their wicked nature, than a fool for their virtue'. Pentheus is an ἀμαθής (fool, 480, 490) who thinks that he can oppose a group's wickedness (216, 232, 489, 512, 779) only to realize too late that he has been mistaken about their power. Or did the king in 778-86 recognize the divine power in the bacchae's outrages just as much as did his messenger, and yet was such a fool that he continued calling bad 'bad' and good 'good'? When the chief defendant of Dionysus-worship in the play, the seer Teiresias, leaves the stage, he clings to Cadmus and says (365-66):

γέροντε δ' αἰσχρὸν δύο πεσεῖν· ἴτω δ' ὅμως,
τῷ Βαχχίῳ γὰρ τῷ Διὸς δουλευτέον.

(It is shameful for two old men to fall; but be that as it may, we must be slaves to Dionysus, son of Zeus). If a correspondence can be identified between the Dionysiac mania in the *Bacchae*, and the spiritual terrorism of the group, then Pentheus in his failure at least contradicted 'better a living slave than a dead king'.

APPENDIX 1

BERND SEIDENSTICKER'S STUDY OF THE PENTHEUS CHARACTER

When a single character from a play is studied in isolation without taking exact account of the development which that character undergoes in the involvements of the plot (the only place, in fact, in which one can read about this imaginary character), one gets a distorted view of that character. This is the case, in my opinion, in, for example, Seidensticker's article *Pentheus* (see p. 17). It is worth examining that article in more detail, because Seidensticker devotes his analysis to a theoretical discussion about the psychological approach.[384] In this we are faced with a key issue in the study of the tragedy.

(a) In the first place one should question this examination of the role of Pentheus, in which the speech and incidents of the action are segmented according to the possible information they can provide about his character. Here no *development* of the character is considered; the author projects an outline profile for which the whole text, divorced from the course of the action, provides the material.

(b) An undeclared assumption in this approach is that Euripides gave a static picture of the make-up of Pentheus' personality. But the question is whether this assumption is correct; kings do not follow an exclusively stereotyped pattern of behaviour on the Euripidean stage any more than do other characters. It is indeed true that Pentheus displays traits which seem typical for a (Theban) tyrant on the tragic stage: apprehension about his own prestige (228-32, 251-52, 503, 803 etc.), suspicion (255-60), anxiety about the welfare of his citizens (780-86). But these traits are an indication of his function as king of Thebes, and are not synonymous with his character in the *Bacchae*.[385]

(c) Seidensticker in his contribution to the psychology of Euripidean tragedy puts forward a false antithesis, when he comments, p. 56: 'Das vorgängige subjektive Urteil des Interpreten, basierend auf dem ganz unterschiedlichen Erfahrungs- und Interessenhintergrund des jeweiligen Rezipienten, kann und muss durch die Erkentnisse der wissenschaftlichen Psychologie objektiviert werden'. The judgement of each individual observer is subjective. But when Seiden-

---

[384] A. Lesky, *Psychologie bei Euripides*, Entretiens Hardt 6 (Geneva 1960) 125-50, and the discussion on it.

[385] One should perhaps question whether a term like 'typical tragedy tyrant' would have meant anything to the Athenian audience, since Attic tragedy comprehended a broad range of kings, cf. B. A. van Groningen, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, *De alleenheerscher op het tragische tooneel der Grieken*. Med. Ned. Akad. Wet. Nieuwe Reeks IV, 12 (Amsterdam 1941) 475-566. Van Groningen makes a favourable judgement on Pentheus (p. 542): 'Pentheus stands out high above all Euripidean kings as a truly tragic figure. The tragedy of the *Bacchae* is a remarkable phenomenon in the whole of his *œuvre*, the hero of that tragedy is no less remarkable among his fellow kings: behold here a ruler who only strives for the good of his city and his people, who, however, in this striving had to fight against superior powers, and therefore by superior power he was cast down.'

sticker tests his subjectively acquired judgement against the operational objectivity of the model of an authoritarian personality from social psychology, it is only his subjective opinion which is considered objectively. Other subjective judgements have no relevance to this specific model, as is illustrated by the appearance in the same year of William Sale's publication about the *Bacchae*, which tests his subjectively acquired judgement against the model of a transvestite from psycho-analysis.[386] Even more important, it seems to me, is the necessity to maintain the established premise that neither the audience's response alone, nor the author's intentions, are patterned on one or other socio-psychological model. (Only in the typology of the new comedy do we see a rigid link between the author and the predetermined model of a stock character: the miser, the matchmaker, the *miles gloriosus*). Finally I believe that a little scepticism is justified when Seidensticker says: 'kann und muss durch die Erkentnisse der wissenschaftlichen Psychologie objektiviert werden'. Surely the history of psychology itself has taught us that too positive an idea of its results is unjustifiable.

(d) Seidensticker's approach can have harmful consequences for tragic interpretation, if models arrived at by psychology are to be applied to the text of a tragedy. This process is implicitly present in Seidensticker's approach, when in discussing the inner unity of the Pentheus character he seizes on the model of the authoritarian personality put forward by the American school of psychology and sociology. The author attaches too much value to the agreement between this model and his own interpretation of the Pentheus character when he states (p. 60): 'Die psychologische Interpretation "führt" also keineswegs, wie Diller meint, "aus der Tragödie hinaus". Der Fall des Pentheus ist gerade bei einer solchen "Psychologisierung" nicht "abseitig", sondern zeitlos "allgemeingültig".' It is true that in Pentheus' character several traits have been revealed which have a general validity for the authoritarian personality, but not that by listing these Pentheus' whole character has been described. The complete picture of Pentheus' personality (naturally hardly as complete as the poet imagined it in his plot) can only be found in the action of the play.

---

[386] The picture of Pentheus sketched for us by Sale displays striking differences from that of the authoritarian personality: (i) Pentheus 'attempts to thrust the masculine outside himself' (Sale 79) *versus* the conviction of male superiority based on general hierarchical authoritarian thinking (Seidensticker 59, = No. 4). (ii) 'transvestism is for him (i.e. Pentheus) the natural efflorescence of the seeds of disease' (Sale 79) *versus* conformism and extensive uncritical acceptance and admiration of traditional norms and values (Seidensticker 59 = No. 5) (iii) 'voyeurism fits Pentheus. It gives him sexual gratification—that is to say, some scope for the irresistible Dionysus—without compelling him to expose his penis. And it gains him entry into the coveted world of women, from which he has felt excluded ever since his mother expressed horror at his exposed phallus' (Sale 79-80) *versus* stereotyped thoughts bound by prejudices; an inclination towards concrete, tangible criteria for the judgement of the environment: sticking-to-the-facts-attitude (Seidensticker 59 = No. 6).

APPENDIX 2

BACCHAE 651-2

Δι. οὐκ εἶπον — ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσας — ὅτι λύσει μέ τις;
Πε. τίς; τοὺς λόγους γὰρ ἐσφέρεις καινοὺς ἀεί.
Δι. ὃς τὴν πολύβοτρυν ἄμπελον φύει βροτοῖς.
Πε. . . . .
Δι. ὠνείδισας δὴ τοῦτο Διονύσῳ καλόν.
Πε. κλῄειν κελεύω πάντα πύργον ἐν κύκλῳ.

The similarity between 649-56 and 498-506 is a reliable indication of a lacuna after 651; Campbell, too, begins his discussion of the problem with: 'Briefly, I find here a dialogue similar to 497-505'. There are three possibilities:

(1) There is no lacuna at all; 652 and 653 are both spoken by Pentheus. Thus Willink (I.41 f.), J. Roux.

(2) There is a lacuna after 651. Thus Reiske, Bruhn, Sandys, Murray, Wilamowitz (in his translation), Grégoire, Campbell, Lacroix. Verdenius too implicitly accepts this solution, I think, since he makes two comments: (i) it is extremely unlikely that 652 is spoken by Pentheus; (ii) a lacuna is not necessary after 652.

(3) There is a lacuna after 652. Thus Hermann, Paley, Tyrrell, Wecklein, Dodds, Kirk.

I should begin by expressing my opinion that the following views are incorrect:

(a) 'Pentheus should express his hostility to wine *en passant*' (Willink). This is wrong (cf. Wilamowitz, *Glaube der Hellenen* II.66 n.4), just as it is wrong to assert that Pentheus takes up a position hostile to sexuality.

(b) Willink and Dodds both defend the idea that the τις in 649 makes Pentheus think that the stranger has a human accomplice. So too L. Koenen, ZPE 6 (1970) 150 f. The idea was heartily welcomed by J. Roux: Pentheus 'ordonne de fermer les portes de Thèbes, pour empêcher non pas l'étranger de fuir, mais celui qui doit le secourir d'entrer dans la ville'. Because this accomplice cannot be the god, the audience, who know that only Dionysus is acting *suo more*, are now saddled with three characters. In his drama Euripides conceived a double identity for the god, and this is already complicated enough; we do not want to have to consider a trinity.

Possibility (1) can therefore be written off both on these grounds and for those reasons listed by Dodds. If Dionysus spoke 652, possibility (3) can also be written off cf. Campbell, Verdenius, and my analysis of the text. The problem is therefore reduced to one single question: did Pentheus or did Dionysus speak line 652?

The objection made to the second alternative is that the word order suggests that the emphasis lies on ὠνείδισας more than on καλόν. The consequence of this is that we must accept καλόν as being ironic, and must therefore ascribe the line to Pentheus. The parallels available to us always have the substantive form ὄνειδος after καλόν and it is clear (cf. Willink 41 n. 1) that here too we must assume ὄνειδος (from ὠνείδισας) with καλόν. The parallels are:

(a) *Med.* 514 f.	Μη.	(εἰ φεύξομαί γε γαῖαν ἐκβεβλημένη) καλόν γ' ὄνειδος τῷ νεωστὶ νυμφίῳ πτωχοὺς ἀλᾶσθαι παῖδας ἥ τ' ἔσωσά σε.
(b) *Pho.* 821	Χο.	(ἔτεκες, ὦ Γαῖ', ...) γένναν ὀδοντοφυῆ, Θήβαις κάλλιστον ὄνειδος.
(c) *IA* 304 f.	Μενέλαος	ἄπελθε· λίαν δεσπόταισι πιστὸς εἶ.
	Πρεσβύτης	καλόν γέ μοι τοὔνειδος ἐξωνείδισας.
(d) S. *OT* 1034 f.	Αγγ.	λύω σ' ἔχοντα διατόρους ποδοῖν ἀκμάς.
	Οιδ.	καλόν γ' ὄνειδος σπαργάνων ἀνειλόμην.

Of these parallels, (a) and (d) are sarcastic, (b) and (c) are not. When it is a case of sarcasm, an auspicious image is combined with καλόν ὄνειδος, namely νύμφιος (a) and σπάργανα (d). This auspicious image is perverted *expressis verbis*, namely: πτωχοὺς ἀλᾶσθαι κτέ. (a) and διατόρους ποδοῖν ἀκμάς (d), although the word order in the two cases is reversed. When it is not sarcastic an apparently inauspicious image, namely γέννα ὀδοντοφυής (b) and λίαν δεσπόταισι πιστὸς εἶ (c) is qualified as auspicious.

What occurs in the *Bacchae*? If 652 is a sarcastic answer by Pentheus to Dionysus' auspicious image in 651, we have a contradictory process, as in (a) and (d), in which, as we saw, it is an auspicious image which is expressed in conjunction with καλόν ὄνειδος. To bring a sarcastic 652, spoken by Pentheus, into line with our parallels, we must assume a line in the lacuna after 652 which would also be spoken by Pentheus, and in which he would effect the perversion of the auspicious image from 651. (i) In so doing Pentheus would be forced to speak of a god whose existence he denies (for him there is still only the stranger). (ii) It also forces a break in the stichomythia. (iii) We must, moreover, accept that the lacuna involves more than one line, since we must find a connecting link for Pentheus' order to close the gates (653). Paley's suggestion, to make Pentheus speak four lines from 652, as a counterpart to 656-59, spoken by the stranger (cf. Dodds), is not acceptable for technical reasons: 656-59 stands, just as does 642-46 at the junction between two scenes, and by it the stichomythia is linked with the rhesis and vice versa; that is not the case with 652-53.

If on the other hand we accept that 652 is not sarcastic, and is spoken by Dionysus, we have a construction that is in agreement with our parallels (b) and (c), with in all three cases a dative of the person for whom the inauspicious image expressed has a proud meaning. If we compare (c) on the one hand with (d), and on the other with our text, it does not seem to me tenable to make the word order an objection to a non-sarcastic use. In 652 δή is ironic. 'Look, now you are gibing at what is Dionysus' pride'. Naturally Διονύσῳ too goes with ὠνείδισας, but the main caesura links it just as much with καλόν. When in 653 Pentheus gives the god his answer by ordering the gates to be shut, he means by so doing to prevent the *Lydian* from leaving Thebes, and going off to celebrate his shameless rites with the Theban women on Cithaeron, and the god understands the intention behind that order, 659: ἡμεῖς δέ σοι μενοῦμεν, οὐ φευξούμεθα.

To fill the lacuna after 651, Reiske suggested:

Πε. χαχόν γε δῶρον, παραφρονεῖν ῳνωμένους.

I find Campbell's suggestion less happy:

Πε. πείθει τε τάλανας πάντ' ἂν ἐκπρᾶξαι δοκεῖν.

We must look for a sarcastic answer by Pentheus to 651 (which was spoken by the stranger): an answer that would attack both the Lydian's misbehaviour, and

his absurd belief in a non-existent god. This was at least the tenor of 499. Therefore I suggest the following question by Pentheus to be read as line 651[a], e.g.:

Πε. ὠνωμένας δ' ὀλοῦντά σέ γε λύει θεός;

I choose ὀλοῦντα because it is a two-edged sword. Pentheus is thinking of 'ruining', used in an unfavourable sense as in Lys.1.8 and compare *IA* 1382: τὸν Ἑλένης τείσαντας ὄλεθρον, but in his answer the god takes the word up in a sense that for him is good, since he is thinking of the revenge which lies before him, now that the liberation of the stranger and of his thiasos has been accomplished. This revenge will involve his ruining Pentheus and all his family, cf. 1269: Διόνυσος ἡμᾶς ὤλεσ', ἄρτι μανθάνω. The use of ὀλλύναι in both these meanings can also be found in *El.* 1065-66. For δέ ... γε see Denn. *GP* 153.

The identical beginning of 651[a] and 652 with ΩΝ- could have been a factor in the loss of 651[a]. There is also another possibility to consider. It is thought (cf. Dodds ad 755-57) that the archetype of L and P had two columns on each page of 35 to 38 lines per column. If this is correct, one can suppose that 651[a] and 687 were at the same height on the same page. Now 687 reads:

ὠνωμένας κρατῆρι καὶ λωτοῦ ψόφῳ.

Is it possible that a copyist first read the wrong column, then realized that it was the wrong column, then took the correct column, and then made his mistake?

APPENDIX 3

BACCHAE 748-68

χωροῦσι δ' ὥστ' ὄρνιθες ἀρθεῖσαι δρόμῳ
πεδίων ὑποτάσεις, αἳ παρ' Ἀσωποῦ ῥοαῖς
εὔκαρπον ἐκβάλλουσι Θηβαίων στάχυν·
Ὑσιάς τ' Ἐρυθράς θ', αἳ Κιθαιρῶνος λέπας
νέρθεν κατῳκήκασιν, ὥστε πολέμιοι
ἐπεσπεσοῦσαι πάντ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω
διέφερον· ἥρπαζον μὲν ἐκ δόμων τέκνα,
ὁπόσα δ' ἐπ' ὤμοις ἔθεσαν, οὐ δεσμῶν ὕπο
προσείχετ' οὐδ' ἔπιπτεν· [ἐς μέλαν πέδον
οὐ χαλκὸς οὐ σίδηρος] ἐπὶ δὲ βοστρύχοις
πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν· οἳ δ' ὀργῆς ὕπο
ἐς ὅπλ' ἐχώρουν φερόμενοι βαχχῶν ὕπο·
οὗπερ τὸ δεινὸν ἦν θέαμ' ἰδεῖν, ἄναξ·
τοῖς μὲν γὰρ οὐχ ᾕμασσε λογχωτὸν βέλος,
οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος, <ἁπαλόχρουν δέμας>·
κεῖναι δὲ θύρσους ἐξανιεῖσαι χερῶν
ἐτραυμάτιζον κἀπενώτιζον φυγῇ
γυναῖκες ἄνδρας, οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν τινος.
πάλιν δ' ἐχώρουν ὅθεν ἐκίνησαν πόδα
κρήνας ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἃς ἀνῆκ' αὐταῖς θεός·
νίψαντο δ' αἷμα, σταγόνα δ' ἐκ παρηίδων
γλώσσῃ δράκοντες ἐξεφαίδρυνον χροός.

751 θ' om. P ‖ 755 Post ὕπο explicit L: λείπει adscr. l ‖ 756 ἐς μέλαν πέδον verba interpolata esse censet John Jackson *Marginalia Scaenica* 17-22, collato 1065: κατῆγεν ἦγεν ἦγεν ἐς μέλαν πέδον ‖ 757 οὐ χαλκὸς οὐ σίδηρος transposuit Jackson post 761 ‖ 758 ἔκαιεν Elmsley: ἐκαίεθ' P ‖ οἱ p : ἡ P ‖ 761 τοῖς Stephanus : τᾶς P, τὰς Brodeau ‖ 761ª οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος ex 757 huc locavit Jackson ‖ ἁπαλόχρουν δέμας scripsi e.g.: ἔνθεον χρόα scripsit Jackson e.g. ‖ 764 γυναῖκες Musurus: -ας P ‖ 768 δράκοντες Reiske: -ος P ‖ ἐξεφέδρυνον P, corr. p.

When the women in their frenzy come down and ὥστε πολέμιοι fall upon Hysiae and Erythrae, they carry off the children there. Why? They are not looting soldiers, who carry off (women and) children to sell as slaves. Nonnus, in his unbounded glorification of Bacchism, did not understand the theft of the children (or did not want to understand it), and made a pretty scene of it.[387] But it is not likely that the women in the *Bacchae* steal the children to suckle them:

[387] XLV 294ff.: ἄλλη δὲ τριέτηρον ἀφαρπάξασα τοκῆος
ἄτρομον ἀστυφέλικτον ἀδέσμιον ὑψόθεν ὤμων
ἵστατο κουφίζουσα μεμηλότα παῖδα θυέλλαις,
ἑζόμενον γελόωντα καὶ οὐ πίπτοντα κονίῃ.
καὶ γλάγος ᾔτεε κοῦρος, ἑὴν ἅτε μητέρα, βάκχην,
στήθεα δ' ἀμφαφάασκεν· κτἑ.

they have left their own sucklings behind, and in the wilderness they have all they need, even cubs, for the needs of those whose breasts are still swollen with mother's milk. The god has brought the Theban women into absolute harmony with nature; the irruption of the herdsmen upon this harmony is answered by the god with a manifestation of his murderous rituals, sparagmos and omophagia. Euripides paints the sparagmos in vivid colours (as he will do with the sparagmos of Pentheus 1126-36); moreover, he leaves no doubt that it is this ritual that he has in mind (cf. 734 f. ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν φεύγοντες ἐξηλύξαμεν / βαχχῶν σπαραγμόν, and 739 σπαράγμασιν). On the other hand he does not say in as many words that the Theban women carry off the children from Hysiae and Erythrae to devour them, but he brings the audience forcefully to this conclusion.

That the audience had this conclusion forcefully presented to them is evident from the text, which Jackson has stripped of two cruces with a touch of genius.[388] I will first of all deal with this evidence, and then return to Jackson's emendation.

The Theban women in their frenzy carry off children and nothing else from the houses in Hysiae and Erythrae. They are not soldiers looking for loot,[389] but βάχχαι ποτνιάδες (664). The god who holds them in his power with his madness,[390] denies them any connection with civilization, and instead imposes on them the life of wild beasts,[391] so that the children of Hysiae and Erythrae

---

[388] Dodds rejected Jackson's suggestion (p. 169 n. 1): 'I find the hypothesis too complicated to be very convincing'. The construction which Jackson raises is indeed very complicated in itself, but it is extremely lucid, cf. L. Koenen, ZPE 6 (1970) 38, who supports him so far as his emendation of 756-57 is concerned. If οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος is the remnant of a line 756^{b} οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος ἔνθεον χρόα (Jackson e.g.), then Jackson's statement, p. 21, is as simple as it is convincing: 'Transposition marks or none, any scholar born after the Renaissance would have taken 756^{b} bodily and replaced it after 761'. J. Roux comments: 'Il n y a pas lieu de supposer une lacune soit après 754, soit après 756, comme le font de nombreux éditeurs (Hartung, Middendorf, Dalmeyda, Murray, Dodds, Grégoire; Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica*, p. 17)'. Obviously Madame Roux had not read Jackson, for he surely offers an alternative for 'the juggling with lacunae' (p. 22).

[389] This is J. Roux's opinion. But in 752 one should not put a comma after ὥστε πολέμιοι, because these words qualify ἐπεσπεσοῦσαι. In 753-54 πάντ' .../ διέφερον does not mean to say that they loot the villages, but that they turn everything upside down: ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω. In 759 φερόμενοι βαχχῶν ὕπο means 'when they had been robbed by the bacchae', i.e. of their children.

[390] Hesych. ποτνιάδες· αἱ βάχχαι. ἀντὶ τοῦ μαινάδες καὶ λυσσάδες, μανίας αἴτιαι. The word contains an active as well as a passive element; they inspire fear and dismay. See Dodds ad 664-67. The word ποτνιάδες is used in two other places in Euripides: *Or.* 318: ποτνιάδες θεαί, ἀβάκχευτον αἳ θίασον ἔλαχετ' ἐν δάκρυσι καὶ γόοις, and *Pho.* 1124, which mentions the ποτνιάδες πῶλοι, depicted on Polyphemus' shield. In both places the context suggests that the poet associates it with Bacchism, and in both places the scholiast refers to Glaucus' mares, which are a counterpart of Actaeon's hounds (see n. 391), cf. Σ *Or.* 318: Πότνιαι γὰρ χωρίον ἐστι Βοιωτίας, ἔνθα φαγοῦσαι βοτάνην αἱ Γλαύκου ἵπποὶ και μανεῖσαι διεσπάσαντο τὸν ἴδιον δεσπότην.

[391] In this wilderness both the hunter and his prey are θήρ, cf. 866ff., 922, 1108, 1210. This complete switch from νόμος to φύσις brings Euripides, in a strongly evocative use of the medium, to the expression in 337ff.: ὁρᾷς τὸν 'Αχτέωνος ἄθλιον μόρον, / ὃν ὠμόσιτοι σχύλαχες ἃς ἐθρέψατο / διεσπάσαντο. In 731 Agave addresses the maenads as ὦ δρομάδες ἐμαὶ χύνες. Winnington-Ingram, p. 97: 'Thus the abandonment by the Bacchanals of their own young children and the lavishing of their milk upon wild creatures is a revolt from the constraints of civilised life, no less than their leaving of their looms and shuttles'. See too p. 147.

mean for them an ὠμοφάγος χάρις (139), but bronze and iron have no meaning for them.[392] When the women have overcome the defence of the inhabitants, they go back with the children they have seized to the place where in the morning they were refreshed by the streams which the god had made appear for them (765-66). There the children were devoured, though the herdsman only touches lightly upon it.[393] This reluctance of Euripides to speak explicitly of omophagia is naturally intentional in this grisly story; where he does speak of it (138, *Fr.* 472 N²) it is of the omophagia of animals, 'but in each place he passes over it swiftly and discreetly' (Dodds, *Introd.* xvii). The vagueness in the text is compensated for: (i) because the audience ask themselves why the women carry off the children; (ii) by the referential meaning of the account of the children being carried off, which gives the audience their answer. The references lie both in mythology (cf. the Minyades) and in the public's assumptions about Bacchic rituals.[394]

---

[392] (i) 'Bronze and iron' means: 'weapons' cf. Pl. *Leg.* xii 956ᵃ, when he speaks of the ἀναθήματα θεοῖσι: σίδηρος δὲ καὶ χαλκὸς πολέμων ὄργανα. The maenad's weapon is her thyrsus (25, 762, 1099). Therefore Bruhn assumed a lacuna before 757, containing the sense: 'Sie rissen die Waffen herab, welche an den Wänden hingen, und zückten sie im Scherze wider einander, aber es verwundete sie οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος. (ii) A participant in one of Wilamowitz' seminars (*Gr. Trag.* IV 230) suggested Thuc. 3.68.3 as evidence that here the bronze and iron are no weapons, but domestic utensils. The weakness of the parallel has already been pointed out by Jackson and Dodds. Besides, it is unlikely that the women, who had fled from their own pots and pans in the city, would now come to carry off those of the villagers.—J. Roux, however, still defends this interpretation (see too *Pillage en Béotie* REG 76 (1963) 34-38), but the parallels she gives are either irrelevant, because it is quite clear that it is a question of other bronze or iron objects or tools than weapons, or they confirm the supposition in (i), particularly the striking parallel in Soph. *Fr.* 500 P, see n. 400. (iii) Dodds makes the sentence which begins with ὁπόσα end with πέδον, and assumes a lacuna to follow it: 'Nothing resisted their assault, not bolted doors, not bronze, not iron'. Jackson has explained why this is not possible, p. 19f.: 'if the entry was so astonishingly easy, then the astonishment should have been expressed when the entry was effected, instead of being sandwiched between a suspension of the law of gravitation and a remarkable exception to the rule that the human hair is inflammable if brought into prolonged contact with fire'. I would add to this: (a) bronze in particular is too valuable a material for door-bolts to be made of it for ordinary peasant huts; (b) the inhabitants were attacked without warning (753), they had not fortified themselves in their dwellings.

[393] 767-68: νίψαντο δ' αἷμα, σταγόνα δ' ἐκ παρηίδων
γλώσσῃ δράκοντες ἐξεφαίδρυνον χροός.

Dodds writes about αἷμα: 'not their own blood, as 761 shows, but that of the mangled cattle'. However, Euripides always uses αἱμάσσω in an evocative way (see n. 398) so that the bloody aspect is emphasized. Therefore it does not seem likely that he would have selected this word in 761 and should at the same time have forgotten that the women were stained with the blood of cattle, only to remember these bloodstains again in 767. The blood that the snakes lick from the maenads' cheeks is the blood of murdered children; the image reminds us of the metaphor in *Hec.* 241f.: ὀμμάτων τ' ἄπο / φόνου σταλαγμοὶ σὴν κατέσταζον γένυν.

[394] There is a *subsidium interpretationis* for us in the pyxis (British Museum) E 775 of Meidias (H. Philippart, No. 92—the vase is contemporary with the *Bacchae*) on which are painted two maenads about to rend a buck to pieces. A third has slung a boy roughly across her shoulder and is holding him by the ankle. Dodds (ad 754): 'Perhaps she is going to eat him'. We also find omophagia of children in [Apollodorus]. Here it is Argive women who are in similar circumstances; only apparently they are eating their own

The text of the *Bacchae* read by Nonnus did not yet, presumably, include the corruption of 757-61 which is in P.[395] If one wants to treat 757 as it has been transmitted, one must accept a lacuna before 757.[396] But the ideas which have been put forward to fill this lacuna (Bruhn, Dodds, see note 392; Tyrrell) differ and are all untenable. Jackson has discussed this.

On the other hand it seems to me that 761 too offers an insuperable difficulty. Here P has τᾶς μὲν, and one must choose between τοῖς μὲν (Stephanus) and τὰς μὲν (Brodeau). In reality we have no choice and we must read τοῖς μέν.[397] In that case ᾕμασσε is a problem, since the verb 'calls for an expressed object' (Dodds). Indeed Euripides always uses αἱμάσσειν in a pictorial way, in which its object is mentioned. This is either (i) a part of the body, from which the blood gushes; or (ii) that which is coloured red by the bloodshed.[398] The absence of an expressed object is removed by Jackson's transposition. His insertion e.g. ἔνθεον χρόα, seems to me too remote an observation for the bewildered herdsman. Therefore I insert, e.g. ἁπαλόχρουν δέμας.[399] The line is perhaps a deliberate reference back to Sophocles.[400]

---

children, 3.5.2: δείξας δὲ Θηβάιοις ὅτι θεός ἐστιν, ἧκεν εἰς Ἄργος, κἀκεῖ πάλιν οὐ τιμώντων αὐτὸν ἐξέμηνε τὰς γυναῖκας. αἱ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοὺς ἐπιμαστιδίους ἔχουσαι παῖδας τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἐσιτοῦντο. The religious and historical background of omophagia is discussed by Dodds, *Introd.* xviiiff. The most intriguing question is whether Euripides and his public knew of the tradition which Pausanias 9.8.2 tells about Potniae (cf. n. 390): ἐνταῦθα καὶ Διονύσου ναός ἐστιν Αἰγοβόλου. θύοντες γάρ τῷ θεῷ προήχθησάν ποτε ὑπὸ μέθης ἐς ὕβριν, ὥστε καὶ τοῦ Διονύσου τὸν ἱερέα ἀποκτείνουσιν· ἀποκτείναντες δὲ αὐτίκα ἐπέλαβε νόσος λοιμώδης, καὶ σφισιν ἀφίκετο ἴαμα ἐκ Δελφῶν τῷ Διονύσῳ θύειν παῖδα ὡραῖον· ἔτεσι δὲ οὐ πολλοῖς ὕστερον τὸν θεόν φασιν αἶγα ἱερεῖον ὑπαλλάξαι σφισιν ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδός.

395 Nonnus only speaks of the children being carried off, not of carrying off bronze and iron. Cf. Tyrrell and Sandys.

396 Or rewrite 756 (Willink), but that would be unreasonable and rash. Willink suggests e.g.: προσείχετ', οὐδ' ἔβριθεν ἐν χερσὶ ξύλον, / οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος.

397 Dodds in his second edition is inclined to accept τὰς μὲν, and is followed in this by Verdenius, who refers to Thuc. 1.132.5 παιδικά ποτε ὢν αὐτοῦ καὶ πιστότατος ἐκείνῳ and to KG I, 649. (i) We only meet this usage (as KG also remarks l.l.) where ἐκεῖνος replaces the oblique cases of αὐτός or of the reflexive pronoun. (ii) If in spite of this we were to accept τὰς μὲν ... κεῖναι δέ ... (J. Roux: 'en ce cas, μέν ... δέ ... opposeraient les verbes plutôt que leurs sujets'), this would still not be Greek. Where the personal or demonstrative pronouns are used in this exceptional way, the subjects of the μέν- and δέ- parts remain the same: KG I, 657f., II, 266 *Anm.* 5. Cf., e.g., Soph. *El.* 448-51: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν μέθες· σὺ δὲ / ... δὸς αὐτῷ. Hom. *Od.* 12, 219-20: τούτου μὲν καπνοῦ καὶ κύματος ἐκτὸς ἔεργε / νῆα, σὺ δὲ σκοπέλου ἐπιμαίεο. Pl. *Phdr.* 247 b-c: αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀθάνατοι καλούμεναι ... ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ νώτῳ, στάσας δὲ αὐτὰς περιάγει ἡ περιφορά· αἱ δὲ θεωροῦσι τὰ ἔξω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

398 (i) κόρας *Hec.* 1117, 1170; *Pho.* 62; λαιμόν *IA* 1084; δέραν *Pho.* 1288; οὐλὴν παρ' ὀφρύν *El.* 573 (pass.); πέσεα *Pho.* 1299 (metonymy: 'πέσος = der fallende Körper', Breitenbach 179); (ii) βωμούς *IA* 226 (corrupt?); σκόπελον *Ion* 274; νᾶμα *Her.* 573 (pass.), ᾠδάς *Ion* 168, but αἱμάξεις is suspect, see Owen.

399 For ἁπαλόχρουν cf. *Hel.* 373f.: ὄνυχι δ' ἁπαλόχροα γένυν δεῦσε φονίαισι πλαγαῖς, for δέμας cf. *Andr.* 1154: πᾶν δ' ἀνήλωται δέμας / τὸ καλλίμορφον τραυμάτων ὑπ' ἀγρίων, *Hel.* 810: οὕτω σιδήρῳ τρωτὸν οὐκ ἔχει δέμας;

400 *Fr.* 500 P οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος ἅπτεται χροός. The fragment is from the *Poimenes.* Pearson: 'the reference is clearly to the invulnerability of Cycnus'. The fragment is in P. Amh. II (1901) No. 12 (Pack² 483), col. ii 13ff., Aristarch. *Comm. Hdt.* 1, 215 σιδήρῳ δὲ οὐδ' ἀργύρῳ χρῶνται. Σοφοκλῆς ἐν Π[οι]μέσι· οὐ χαλκὸς οὐ σίδηρος ἅπτεται χροός. Cf. A. H. R. E. Paap, *De Herodoti Reliquis in Papyris et Membranis Aegypti Servatis.* (Lugduni Batavorum 1948) 37ff. Herodotus reports in this chapter that the Massagetes use only

With the transposition of οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος the sentence which begins in 754 with ἥρπαζον μὲν ἐκ δόμων τέκνα, makes complete sense. The next question to arise is what we must do in the break of the trimeter, which comes down to the question of which hypothesis we must assume to clarify the text immediately following the dislocation. The speculative element in such a hypothesis is evident (see Jackson p. 22), and far greater than the transposition of οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος, which in my opinion can hardly be called speculative. In a witty argument Jackson pleads for the rejection of ἐς μέλαν πέδον, comparing 1065. Naturally his argument is not conclusive, since it is built on the psychological effect of κατῆγεν, ἦγεν, ἦγεν, and not on the fairly normal πίπτειν (πίτνειν) ἐς πέδον. I would prefer to keep ἐς μέλαν πέδον—consequently, half a line must have been lost. One can think of, e.g.:

οὐ δεσμῶν ὕπο
προσείχετ', οὐδ' ἔπιπτεν ἐς μέλαν πέδον,
αὐτόματα δ' αὐταῖς ἥπτετ'· ἐπὶ δὲ βοστρύχοις
πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν.

(I find the dative αὐταῖς and the passive ἥπτετο better than αὐτῶν ἥπτετ', because αὐταῖς ἥπτετο emphasizes the supernatural aspect of the occurrence; cf. 447: αὐτόματα δ' αὐταῖς δεσμὰ διελύθη ποδῶν).[401]

---

bronze and gold, bronze for weapons, and gold for adornment, σιδήρῳ δὲ οὐδ' ἀργύρῳ χρέωνται οὐδέν· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ σφι ἔστι ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, ὁ δὲ χρυσὸς καὶ ὁ χαλκὸς ἄπλετος. Herodotus naturally means that if this had not been the case the Massagetes would also have used iron for weapons and silver for adornment. Paap l.l. states that Aristarchus wished to show that Sophocles drew from the work of the Halicarnassian (but see Radt ad loc.). Naturally, by οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος, Sophocles means the same as does Euripides, πολέμων ὄργανα. Cycnus was not vulnerable to weapons; to kill him Achilles had to strangle him.

[401] The alternative to Jackson's hypothesis is that the copyist, while writing 757, must have realized that he had made a mistake. He wrote the right words for the first half of 757 (before the caesura) in the margin or between the lines, and continued with the correct text. At a later stage the words αὐτόματα δ' αὐταῖς ἥπτετ' were wrongly seen as an explanation of the text, and were lost from the transmitted version. One can think of many reasons for the disappearance of 761^{a}, for example (a) erasion of οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος as an intrusive repetition; (b) the thought that 761 was complete, because the corrector read τὰς μέν and not τοῖς μέν. There is, however, still an objection: οὐ δεσμῶν ὕπο / προσείχετ' οὐδ' ἔπιπτεν is a very rare usage in tragedy, where οὐδέ is used as a balancing adversative with the meaning: 'still did not', 'but still not', Parallels are A. *Ag.* 263, S. *El.* 132, and, remarkably enough, *Bacchae* 758: ἐπὶ δὲ βοστρύχοις πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν. In these cases οὐδέ 'sets a negative idea in the scale against a preceding positive one' (Denn. GP 191). In our passage too, οὐ δεσμῶν ὕπο προσείχετο conveys a positive idea in relation to ἔπιπτεν ἐς μέλαν πέδον. But in the instances referred to the οὐδέ-part of the sentence is not continued with a third clause, as would be quite usual in epic: καὶ βάλεν 'Ατρείδαο κατ' ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἐίσην, / οὐδ' ἔρρηξεν χαλκός, ἀνεγνάμφθη δέ οἱ αἰχμή (*Il.* 3.347f., fere eadem 7.258f., 17.43f., Hes. *Sc.* 414f.). If we follow the alternative possibility, then we have an epic idiom for which I can find no parallel in Euripides (unless with Triclinius we read οὐδέ in place of ὁ δέ in *Or.* 35, but this seems to be excluded). Apart from that a number of cases in Denniston do not in my opinion seem to belong in that idiom; in *Il.* 24.25 οὐδέ is 'holding apart incompatibles', GP 191 (ii), just as *Od.* 3.141, S. *OC* 481; the meaning there is not 'and still not', but 'but not'. Nevertheless, if one does not wish to follow Jackson in the rejection of ἐς μέλαν πέδον, the alternative suggested above may be acceptable, for in fact the distinction between οὐδέ = 'but still not', and οὐδέ = καὶ οὐ 'simply adding a negative idea

The part of the herdsman's rhesis, in which the rape of the children from Hysiae and Erythrae is narrated (748-68) therefore contains four sections following logically on each other: (i) the bacchae attack the villages (748-54); (ii) they carry off the children (754-58); (iii) the people in the villages try in vain to prevent them being carried off (758-64); (iv) the bacchae withdraw again with their prey to the mountains (765-68). Outside the events outlined stands the remark in line 757 f.: ἐπὶ δὲ βοστρύχοις / πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν. That the bacchae set braziers with glowing coals on their heads (J. Roux) is indeed most unlikely. Or is the fire 'taken from the domestic hearths of the villagers'? (Dodds). Such a marvel is not however to be explained by a reference to ἀνθρακοβάται from cultural anthropology.[402] A reminiscence of epic (*Il.* 5.4-7, 18.205-14) also seems unlikely: the fire described by the herdsman is clearly meant to be real. Finally, what are maenads doing with *fire*? Don't they eat their meat *raw*? Could the words ἐπὶ δὲ βοστρύχοισιν πῦρ ἔφερον, οὐδ' ἔκαιεν, be a later addition to explain οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος? In that case the interpolator may have had in mind the firepots, which are also thought up by J. Roux. There are no compelling arguments for concluding that it is an interpolation; however, I believe that the words are somewhat suspect because they are a superfluous embellishment of the bacchae's marvellous deeds.

To sum up: the dislocation of οὐ χαλκός, οὐ σίδηρος from 761^a to 757 has been the source of all troubles. As a possible alternative for Jackson's rejection of ἐς μέλαν πέδον in 756, it is equally possible that a half line has been lost; further, the dislocation may have caused a spurious 757^b and 758^a; Euripides himself may have written:

ἥρπαζον μὲν ἐκ δόμων τέκνα,
ὁπόσα δ' ἐπ' ὤμοις ἔθεσαν, οὐ δεσμῶν ὕπο
προσείχετ' οὐδ' ἔπιπτεν ἐς μέλαν πέδον,
αὐτόματα δ' αὐταῖς ἥπτεθ'· οἳ δ' ὀργῆς ὕπο
ἐς ὅπλ' ἐχώρουν φερόμενοι βακχῶν ὕπο.

---

to a positive one' (Denn. GP 192 (iii)) is a very subtle one. Cf. 436-37: ὁ θὴρ δ' ὅδ' ἡμῖν πρᾶος, οὐδ' ὑπέσπασεν φυγῇ πόδ', ἀλλ' ἔδωκεν ... χέρας. Here οὐδέ means 'and not'; it does not mean 'but still not'. Even so, πράος (ἦν) corresponds with οὐδ' ὑπέσπασεν φυγῇ πόδα, just as in our passage οὐ δεσμῶν ὕπο προσείχετο corresponds with οὐδ' ἔπιπτεν ἐς μέλαν πέδον. Cf. *Hec.* 597 (οὔκουν δεινόν, εἰ ... μὲν ...) ὁ δ' ἐσθλὸς ἐσθλός, οὐδὲ συμφορᾶς ὕπο / φύσιν διέφθειρ', ἀλλὰ χρηστός ἐστ' ἀεί; *IA* 1122-23 τέκνον, τί κλαίεις, οὐδ' ἔθ' ἡδέως ὁρᾷς, / ἐς γῆν δ' ἐρείσασ' ὄμμα πρόσθ' ἔχεις πέπλους;

402 Walking barefoot over glowing coals (described in detail by J. Roux) is not the same as carrying fire on one's head. Iamblichus (*De Myst.* III. 4) is thinking, I believe, of the first (εἰς πῦρ φέρονται καὶ πῦρ διαπορεύονται) and goes on to speak of insensitivity to injury. This is a phenomenon of religious ecstasy, but in his description Euripides had another object than wanting to describe religious ecstasy. The maenads are not insensitive to fire and weapons, but they are invulnerable.

BACCHAE 135-69

ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν ὅστις ἂν ἐκ –⏑⏑⏑͡⏑⏑–⏑͡⏑– aeolo-ionic
θιάσων δρομαίων ⏑⏑–⏑––‖
πέσῃ πεδόσε, νεβρίδος ἔχων ἱερὸν ἐνδυτόν, ἀγρεύων
⏑–⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑⏑–⏑⏑⏑–– 5 cr
αἷμα τραγοκτόνον, ὠμοφάγον χάριν, 4 da
ἱέμενος ἐς ὄρεα Φρύγια, Λύδια. –⏑⏑͡⏑⏑⏑͡⏑⏑⏑͡⏑⏑–⏑⏑ ‖ 3 tr
ὁ δ' ἔξαρχος Βρόμιος. ⏑–––⏑⏑–‖ dim B (‸wil)
εὐοῖ. –– extra metrum
ῥεῖ δὲ γάλακτι πέδον, ῥεῖ δ' οἴνῳ, 7 da
ῥεῖ δὲ μελισσᾶν νέκταρι.
Συρίας δ' ὡς λιβάνου κα- ionics
πνός· ὁ Βακχεὺς δ' ἀνέχων
πυρσώδη φλόγα πεύκας
ἐκ νάρθηκος ἀίσσει
δρόμῳ καὶ χοροῖσιν
πλανάτας ἐρεθίζων
ἰαχαῖς τ' ἀναπάλλων
τρυφερόν <τε> πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων.
ἅμα δ' εὐάσμασι τοιάδ' ἐπιβρέμει· ὦ
ἴτε βάκχαι [ὦ] ἴτε βάκχαι.
Τμώλου χρυσορόου χλιδά, aeolic
μέλπετε τὸν Διόνυσον
βαρυβρόμων ὑπὸ τυμπάνων,
εὔια τὸν εὔιον ἀγαλλόμεναι θεὸν 2 cr 2 da
ἐν Φρυγίαισι βοαῖς ἐνοπαῖσί τε 4 da
λωτὸς ὅταν εὐκέλαδος 2 cr
ἱερὸς ἱερὰ παίγματα βρέμῃ σύνοχα tr 2 cr
φοιτάσιν εἰς ὄρος εἰς ὄρος· 3 da
ἡδομένα δ' ἄρα, πῶλος ὅπως ἅμα ματέρι φορβάδι 11 da
κῶλον ἄγει ταχύπουν σκιρτήμασι βάκχα.

135 ἡδύ γ' Dobree ‖ ὅστις ἂν scribo, suspexerat Wecklein: ὅταν P et add. in L Tricl. (cf. G. Zuntz, *Inquiry* 117 adn.): ὃς ἂν R. Gompf ‖ 136 πεύσῃ P ‖ πεδόσσε P ‖ ἀγορεύων LP, corr. Tricl. ‖ 141 ὅδ' ἔξαρχος Kamerbeek Mnem. IV.6 (1953) 192: verba ὁ δ'-εὐοῖ ante ἡδὺς collocavit Wilamowitz 135-141 rescripsit Willink I.31 ita: ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσσιν, ὅταν / ἐκ θιάσων δρομάδων <βάκχα προκαμοῦσα> πέ- / σῃ πεδόσ', ὁ δ' ἐξάρχει Βρόμιος, εὐοῖ, / νεβρίδος ἔχων ἱερὸν ἐνδυτόν, ἀγρεύων κτλ. ‖ 144 νέκταρ συρείας P ‖ 145 ἀνέχων Wilamowitz: ἔχων LP (καπνὸν ὁ Βακχεύς ἀνέχων voluit Wilamowitz) ‖ 147 χοροῖς LP, corr. Murray ‖ 148 ἐρεθίζων πλανάτας (πλάνος P) LP, invertit Wilamowitz ‖ 150 τε add. Wilamowitz ‖ 151 εὐάσμασιν Elmsley: ἐπ' εὐάσμασιν LP ‖ ἐπιβρέμει τοιάδ' LP, invertit Murray ‖ 153 ὦ erasum in L ‖ 154 χλιδά Reiske: χλιδᾶ LP ‖ 169 βάκχου LP, corr. Musgrave.

135 ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν κτλ. A very controversial passage in the play in the field of textual criticism, to say nothing of the metre. The crucial question is: who falls to the ground? The god, already named in 134, or the celebrant of the rite? Those who accept ὅταν assume that the god falls to the ground, or insert, like Paley, the implied subject 'the bacchant', but the implication is not a possible one. Those who accept ὃς ἂν let the bacchant fall.

Is it acceptable that in this epode it is the god who falls to the ground and performs the rituals of sparagmos and omophagia? I think not; I have argued in chapter 8 that during the oreibasia these rituals are an ἀγών for those celebrating the rites (p. 138 and n. 333) and that the presence of the god is revealed in the cult manifestation, which makes the divine presence apparent in (i) the tokens of milk, wine and honey (142-43), and (ii) in his personal appearance (144-53). I cannot agree with the tempting observation by J. C. Kamerbeek (1953) 193, who indeed recognized that the epode describes the god's epiphany: 'Il va sans dire que ce dieu-là est en réalité l'hypostase de leur propre surexcitation'. Taken on its own, the thought may well express Euripides' idea about the reality of divine epiphanies outside the theatre, but in the theatrical reality of the play the idea is irrelevant, because it would disturb the dramatic experience of divine epiphany which the audience obtain from the parodos. In a recent article, W. J. Verdenius (Mnem. IV.34 (1981) 309) calls this 'a fundamental misconception, for the dramatic experience of the audience presupposes a psychological understanding of the religious background of the play'. It is not a matter of dispute, however, whether the god takes part in his own rituals: his epithets like ταυροφάγος and ὠμηστής are sufficient proof. Rightly, I think, Verdenius cites Winnington-Ingram: 'The religion of Dionysus blurred the distinction between god and man'. But in the parodos of the *Bacchae* the chorus are describing the nature of the mortals who celebrate the god's rites, 72-87, 105-19, and cf. p. 134. In the intervening antistrophes they relate myths about the god. When they come (135) to their most intimate excitement, the mountain dance and its subsequent events, they are longing desparately to be united with the god. Reading ὅταν in 135 with the MSS then gives: 'Welcome (the god) in the mountains, when he leaves the running thiasos and falls to the ground'—when his ecstasy makes him unconscious (Verdenius, referring to Dodds). Dodds' commentary runs in full: 'I suspect that the words (*viz.* πέσῃ πεδόσε) describe a moment when the celebrant falls unconscious and the god enters into him'. I cannot understand how this song, welcoming the god, passes so swiftly to the identification of god and man.—On the other hand, the sense is clear when the chorus sing: 'Well pleasing in the mountains, whosoever leaves the running thiasos and falls to the ground': unconscious or not, in a state of extreme happiness or extreme repulsion, feeling the god entering into him, or whatever the nature of Dionysiac ecstasy may be.

Therefore, I think that ὅταν in 135 is corrupt and should be replaced by ὃς ἂν or ὅστις ἂν (either is acceptable; I slightly prefer ὅστις ἄν, once suggested by Wecklein).

The beginning of the epode has been characterized by Deichgräber (1935) 326 as 'Anfang, der wieder als Seligpreisung gestaltet ist'. The logical connection between the first and second strophes and the epode is obvious: *strophe 1*: happy is he who knows the rites of the gods and who is a member of the thiasos; *strophe 2*: (therefore) Thebes, join in the roll of cities who worship Dionysus; *epode*: (for indeed) a sweet joy is he who performs the ritual in the hills, since he is guided by Bromios.

There is no objection to ἡδύς in 135. The meaning (cf. Dodds, p. 86 *note* 2): well pleasing, joy-giving (as *Ion* 641) could here imply that the celebrant gives pleasure to the god: he offers joy to Dionysus just as the satyrs do during the trieteris (134).[403] On the other hand, celebrating the rites is a pleasant sensation for the celebrants themselves, at least within the pattern of their ecstatic feelings, for the cruelty of omophagia is called a χάρις by them (138). Within this context, then, the implication 'to fall to the ground and perform the prescribed actions is a joy-giving experience' is also present; a further emendation ἡδύ γ' is not necessary.[404]

The physical presence of the god is mentioned in 141: ὁ δ' ἔξαρχος Βρόμιος. εὐοῖ. This line is followed by a description of the Dionysiac miracles of the earth flowing with milk, wine and honey (142-43), and by a description of the dancing god (144-53). It is crucial that both Βρόμιος (141) and ὁ Βακχεύς (145) only, in a literal sense, define Dionysus, and that Dodd's understanding of ὁ Βακχεύς in 145: 'The Bacchic One (i.e. the god temporarily incarnate in the celebrant)' is incorrect.[405] See Kirk ad 145, who stresses the importance of keeping the god and the celebrant separate here. It is the god himself who is visibly present in person among those who celebrate his rites.[406]

---

[403] Verdenius l.l. 308 objects to the implication 'well pleasing (to the god)' with: 'the context excludes rather than suggests such an ellipse'. I fail to see this. Verdenius rightly says that the context: ... αἷς χαίρει Διόνυσος ‖ ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν ὅταν ... makes it quite clear that with ἡδύς Dionysus is meant. Likewise, if we read: ... αἷς χαίρει Διόνυσος. ‖ ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν ὃς ἂν ... (or ὅστις ἂν ...), it is implied that it is the joy of Dionysus that is aroused by the deeds of the bacchant.

[404] *Or.* 542 ζηλωτὸς ὅστις εὐτύχησεν ἐς τέκνα implies ζηλωτόν ἐστιν εὐτυχεῖν ἐς τέκνα. In the same way, *Ph.* 954f., ὅστις δ' ἐμπύρῳ χρῆται τέχνῃ, μάταιος implies μάταιόν ἐστιν ἐμπύρῳ χρῆσθαι τέχνῃ.

[405] Cf. J. Roux (ad loc.), who traces the use of the cult epithet ὁ Βακχεύς for the god himself in literature (compare too S. *Ant.* 1121). The title Βρόμιος, which is very common in the *Bacchae* (66, 84, 88, 115, 141, 329, 375, 412, 446, 536, 584, 592, 629, 726, 790, 976, 1031, 1250), is exclusively used to refer to the god personally; the adjective βρόμιος, 'of Bromios', 'bacchic' (*Her.* 892, *Hel.* 1308, cf. LSJ s.v.) is meaningless in the context of 141, since all members of Dionysus' thiasos are possessed. Perhaps the title is particularly linked with the manifestation of the god with his thundering voice (ἐπιβρέμει, 151), cf. 582ff.: ἰὼ ἰὼ δέσποτα δέσποτα, μόλε νῦν ἡμέτερον ἐς θίασον, ὦ Βρόμιε Βρόμιε and 592, 629, 726, 1031. If the assumption is correct that Pindar wrote his second dithyramb (*fr.* 75 Snell) for the Anthesteria (cf. Pickard-Cambridge DFA² 16f.), the mention of the god in line 10: τὸν Βρόμιον, τὸν Ἐριβόαν τε βροτοὶ καλέομεν is perhaps intended by the poet as a reference to his epiphany during the festival.

[406] Cf. 306f.: ἔτ' αὐτὸν ὄψῃ κἀπὶ Δελφίσιν πέτραις
πηδῶντα σὺν πεύκαισι δικόρυφον πλάκα.
Cf. *Ion* 717f.: ἵνα Βάκχιος ἀμφιπύρους ἀνέχων πεύκας
λαιψηρὰ πηδᾷ νυκτιπόλοις ἅμα σὺν βάκχαις,
and the first lines of the *Hypsipyle* (*Fr.* 752 N²):
Διόνυσος, ὃς θύρσοισι καὶ νεβρῶν δοραῖς
καθαπτὸς ἐν πεύκῃσι Παρνασὸν κάτα
πηδᾷ χορεύων παρθένοις σὺν Δελφίσιν.
Dionysus is described as god made manifest by Philodamus in his hymn as follows, 19ff.:
πᾶσα δ' ὑμνοβρύης χόρευ-
ε[ν Δελφῶ]ν ἱερὰ μάκαιρα χώρα·
αὐτὸς δ' ἀστε[ρόεν δ]έμας
φαίνων Δελφίσι σὺν κόραις
[Παρν]ασσοῦ πτύχας ἔστας.

This manifestation is described in ionics, and begins with Συρίας δ' ὡς λιβάνου καπνός, 'there (breathes) a reek as of Syrian incense' (Sandys). Wilamowitz' emendation καπνόν is unnecessary, cf. Kamerbeek l.l. I take δέ after ὁ Βακχεύς to be explanatory, since the smoke originates from the torch in the god's hand. In 147 ἐκ νάρθηκος is instrumental, ἀίσσει is intransitive. Darting off with his narthex the god springs into movement and leads his bacchae in a dancing run (δρόμῳ καὶ χοροῖσιν) over the hills.[407]

153 ὦ ἴτε βάκχαι ἴτε βάκχαι is all that the god cries. From 154 the bacchae, filled with joy, are again the speakers, cf. Wilamowitz *Versk.* 578 n. 2, who, however, puts the change of speaker at the second [ὦ] ἴτε βάκχαι.

Everything that has been said about 'the strange medley of metres' (Miss Dale LM 126) in this epode, has proved to be highly controversial. Together with the analysis of the text of the epode I have given a metrical analysis which rests upon one main observation, namely that the structure of the epode shows an unmistakable A-B-A scheme, cf. Willink (1966) 31. In this structure an echo of words and meanings appears in the two A sections (135-43) and (154-69): ἡδύς — ἡδομένα, ἐν ὄρεσιν — εἰς ὄρος εἰς ὄρος, δρομαίων — φοιτάσιν, ἱερὸν ἐνδυτόν — λωτὸς ἱερός, ἱέμενος — κῶλον ἄγει ταχύπουν, ἐς ὄρεα Φρύγια Λύδια — Τμώλου χρυσορόου χλιδά / Φρυγίαισι. These sections also have a similar metrical structure, whereas the central part (144-53) has been appropriately written in *ionici a minore,* the rhythm of the cult hymn to Dionysus, because this central part describes the epiphany of the dancing god.[408]

The A sections have an aeolic opening,[409] followed by a mixture of dactyls,

---

The god is the real leader, ἔξαρχος of the dance, Ar. *Th.* 987f.: ἡγοῦ δέ γ' ὧδ' αὐτός, κισσοφόρε Βακχεῖε δέσποτα.

[407] This is a more fitting picture of the running, dancing and shouting god than to take ἀίσσει causative: 'causes movement', and to understand ἐκ νάρθηκος as 'beating the rhythm of the dance' (J. Roux, cf. Verdenius (1981) 312). On the other hand: 'lets (the flame) stream from his wand' (Dodds) is impossible. The pine torch and the narthex are two different objects, as J. Roux rightly explains.

[408] Wilamowitz' addition in 150 τρυφερόν <τε> πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθέρα ῥίπτων makes the line a ionic trimeter. I do not agree with Willink's objection to it, (1966) 36, followed by Verdenius (1981) 312, that ἐρεθίζων and ἀναπάλλων are parallel and require τε, but that 'tossing his hair' is different in kind, and needs to be subjoined ('while ...'). There is no difference in kind, because this ionic pnigos describes the god in his epiphany, or, to cite Winnington-Ingram 37, the bacchants 'are more than half in love with him as he tosses his long sensual locks in the air and bids them join him in the Bacchic dance'.

[409] Schroeder and Wilamowitz rightly interpreted the opening line as aeolic. Reading ὃς ἄν, this would give:

ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν ὃς ἄν   –⏑⏑⏑͡⏑⏑⏑͡⏑
ἐκ θιάσων δρομαίων   –⏑⏑–⏑––

Dodrans + Aristophanean. Reading ὅστις ἄν, the opening line would have a striking similarity to the opening metres of the preceding strophes:

72 ὦ μάκαρ ὅστις εὐδαίμων τελετὰς θεῶν εἰδὼς βιοτὰν ἁγιστεύει
–⏑⏑–⏑–.––´⏑⏑–⏑–.––´⏑⏑–⏑–.–– ‖

105 ὦ Σεμέλας τροφοὶ Θῆβαι, στεφανοῦσθε κισσῷ
–⏑⏑–⏑–.––´⏑⏑–⏑–.–∧‖

135 ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν ὅστις ἂν ἐκ θιάσων δρομαίων
–⏑⏑⏑͡⏑⏑–.⏑͡⏑–´⏑⏑–⏑–.–∧‖

cretics (paeons) and trochees. The sections come to an end with a slower flow of dactyls.[410] Outside this metrical correspondence stands the announcement of the god himself in 141: ὁ δ' ἔξαρχος Βρόμιος. εὐοῖ.[411]

So the general metrical pattern of the epode seems clear; the details, however, are among the most striking obscurities of Euripidean versification.[412]

The metre must then be labeled aeolo-ionic, cf. Miss Dale LM 126ff. In the "procephalic ionic dimeter", with which both strophes and the epode all begin, the first element is always a long syllable, by which it is related to aeolo-choriambic. Compare for the resolution of the (apparent) choriambus in ἡδὺς ἐν ὄρεσιν 123: ἔνθα τριχόρυθες. The resolution in ὅστις ἄν points to an answer to whether in 72 ὦ μάκαρ ὅστις εὐδαίμων and other cola of this type 'the penultimate syllable is dragged (with long *anceps*) or the crucial true long of ionic' (Miss Dale LM 127): the syllable is a true long of ionic. In that case, the whole of 123-25 (~108-10) is probably aeolo-ionic:

ἔνθα τριχόρυθες ἄντροις βυρ-	–⏑⏑⏑͡⏑⏑–.––
σότονον κύκλωμα τόδε μοι	⏑⏑–⏑–⏑⏑͡⏑–
Κορύβαντες εὗρον.	⏑⏑–⏑–.–∧‖

Note the characteristic στεφανοῦσθε κισσῷ-colon at the end, which is the catalectic version of Διόνυσον ὑμνήσω.

[410] 142 ῥεῖ δὲ γάλακτι πέδον κτλ. seven dactyls. νέκταρι cannot end a period, but an exception must be made here. Cf. Miss Dale's comment ad A. *Ag.* 153: οὐ δεισήνορα (*Observations on Dactylic*, WS 77 (1964) 15ff. = *Collected Papers* 190): 'Indeed so strong is the effect of a change of rhythm that one is tempted to make this an exception to normal classical usage and suppose a period-close in an open dactyl'.

[411] But I am not sure whether 164: φοιτάσιν εἰς ὄρος εἰς ὄρος are really dactyls (see preceding note). Perhaps we must take the colon as an Ibycean, set in correspondence to 141.

[412] The greatest stumbling-blocks lie in 135-41. F. Ferrari, *La parodo delle Baccanti: moduli e composizione*, Quaderni Urbinati 32 (1979) 69-79, interprets the lines throughout (with the exception of αἷμα τραγοκτόνον, ὠμοφάγον χάριν, 4 da) as dochmiacs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The abbreviations used in this book are the same as those in Liddell and Scott's lexicon (LSJ), or are less severely abbreviated. Titles of journals are abbreviated as in L'Année Philologique, founded by J. Marouzeau, with the exception of Mnem. for Mnemosyne. Other abbreviations are:

Miss Dale, LM: A. M. Dale, The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama.
Denn. GP: J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles.
DFA^{2}: A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, The Dramatic Festivals of Athens.
KG: R. Kühner-B. Gerth.
LSJ: H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford ^{9}1940; E. A. Barber a.o., A Supplement. Oxford 1968.
TrGF: Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta.

Works referred to in abbreviated form are listed in more detail below.

(a) *Editions, commentaries and translations*

The following editions are referred to only by the name of the editor.

(i) Euripides *Bacchae*

Editio Aldina (Marcus Musurus), Venetiis 1504.
Willem Canter, Euripidis tragoediae XIX ... Antwerp 1571.
P. Stephanus, Geneva 1602.
Sam. Musgrave, Euripidis quae exstant omnia ... Oxford 1778.
Aug. Matthiae, Euripidis tragoediae et fragmenta. Leipzig 1813-1824.
Peter Elmsley, Euripidis Bacchae. Rec. ... Oxford 1821. Edit. auct. Leipzig 1822.
G. Hermann, Euripidis Bacchae. Leipzig 1823.
Theob. Fix, Euripidis fabulae. Recogn. ... Paris 1844.
F. G. Schoene, Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Erkl. von —. 1es Bändchen, Bakchen, Iphigeneia in Taurien. Berlin ^{2}1858.
Adolphus Kirchhoff, Euripidis Fabulae. Berlin 1867. [Bacchae vol. 1]
August Nauck, Euripidis Tragoediae. Leipzig ^{3}1871. [Bacchae vol. 1]
Robert Yelverton Tyrrell [1871], The Bacchae of Euripides with a Revision of the Text and a Commentary, London 1871.
F. A. Paley, Euripides, with an English Commentary. Vol. II, London ^{2}1874.
N. Wecklein [1879, 1903], Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Drittes Bändchen: Bacchen. Leipzig 1879, ^{2}1903.
Ewald Bruhn, Ausgewählte Tragödien des Euripides. Erstes Bändchen: Die Bakchen. Berlin ^{3}1891.
Robert Yelverton Tyrrell [1892]. The Bacchae of Euripides with a Revision of the Text and a Commentary. London 1892. (Macmillan Classical Series)
N. Wecklein [1898], Euripidis Fabulae, ediderunt R. Prinz et N. Wecklein, vol. II pars III: Euripidis Bacchae. Leipzig 1898.
John Edwin Sandys, The Bacchae of Euripides with Critical and Explanatory Notes and with Numerous Illustrations from Works of Ancient Art. Cambridge ^{4}1900.
G. Dalmeyda, Paris 1908.
Gilbert Murray, Euripidis Fabulae ... Vol. 3, Oxford ^{2}1913.
Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Griechische Tragödien. Übersetzt von —. Band 4.13: Die Bakchen. Berlin 1923.
D. W. Lucas, The Bacchae of Euripides. The Greek Text as performed at Cambridge at the New Theatre, 4-8 March, 1930 by members of the university together with an English prose translation. Cambridge 1930.

Gilbert Murray, Collected Plays of Euripides. Translated into English rhyming verse with commentaries and notes. London 1954.
E. R. Dodds, Euripides Bacchae. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford 1944, ^{2}1960. (Unless otherwise specified the reference is always to the second edition. The printed text is that of Murray.)
A. Tovar, Euripides Tragedias II: Las Baccantes-Hécuba. Texto revisado y traducido. Barcelona 1960.
Henri Grégoire, Euripide tome VI^{2}: Les Bacchantes. Texte établi et traduit, avec le concours de Jules Meunier. Paris 1961.
Jeanne Roux, Euripide Les Bacchantes. I. Introduction, texte et traduction, Paris 1970. II. Commentaire, Paris 1972.
Geoffrey S. Kirk, The Bacchae by Euripides. A translation with Commentary. Englewood Cliffs N.J. 1970.
Maurice Lacroix, Les Bacchantes d'Euripide, Introduction, texte et commentaire, analyse métrique des parties lyriques. Paris 1976.

(ii) Other editions

Aeschylus, *Ag.* E. Fraenkel, Oxford 1950; P. Groeneboom, Groningen 1944. *Eu.* P. Groeneboom, Groningen 1952. *Fr.* A. Nauck (TGF); H. J. Mette, Berlin 1959. *Oresteia* W. G. Headlam-G. Thomson, Amsterdam-Prague ^{2}1966.
Archilochus, M. Treu, Göttingen 1959.
Aristophanes, J. van Leeuwen, Leiden 1893-1906; *Ec.* R. G. Ussher, Oxford 1973. *Fr.* Th. Kock (CAF); *Lys.* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Berlin 1927. *Nu.* K. J. Dover, Oxford 1968. *Pax* M. Platnauer, Oxford 1964. *Ra.* W. B. Stanford, London 1958. *V.* W. J. M. Starkie, London 1897; D. M. MacDowell, Oxford 1971.
Aristoteles, *Poet.* A. Rostagni, Turin ^{2}1945; D. W. Lucas, Oxford 1968.
Euripides, *Alc.* A. M. Dale, Oxford 1954. *Andr.* P. T. Stevens, Oxford 1971. *Cret.* R. Cantarella, Milan 1964. *El.* J. D. Denniston, Oxford 1939. *Fr.* (unless otherwise specified) A. Nauck (TGF); H. J. Mette, Lustrum 12 (1967) 1-288 and 13 (1968) 289-403. *Her.* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Berlin ^{2}1895. *Hel.* A. M. Dale, Oxford 1967; R. Kannicht, Heidelberg 1969. *Hipp.* W. S. Barrett, Oxford 1964. *Hyps.* G. W. Bond, Oxford 1963. *IT* M. Plathauer, Oxford 1938. *Ion* A. S. Owen, Oxford 1939. *Med.* D. L. Page, Oxford 1938. *Or.* W. Biehl, Berlin 1965 comm.; V.di Benedetto, Florence 1965. *Phaëth.* J. Diggle, Cambridge 1970. *Phrixus B* H. van Looy, Brussels 1964. *Supp.* C. Collard, Groningen 1975. *Tel.* C. Austin, Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta. Berlin 1968.
Gregorius Nazianzenus [?] *Christus Patiens*, A. Tuilier, Paris 1969.
Hesiodus, *Fr.* R. Merkelbach-M. L. West, Oxford 1967. *Th.* M. L. West, Oxford 1966.
Hymni Homerici, T. W. Allen, W. R. Halliday, E. E. Sikes, Oxford ^{2}1936; J. Humbert, Paris ^{4}1959; F. Càssola, Verona 1975.
Lyrici: (D) Anthologia Lyrica Graeca, E. Diehl, Leipzig 1925; fasc. 1-2 ^{3}1949-1952.
Lyrici: (W) Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati, M. L. West, Oxford 1971-1972.
Lyrici: (PMG) Poetae Melici Graeci, D. L. Page, Oxford 1962. Supplementum, Oxford 1974.
Lyrici: (L.-P.) Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta, E. Lobel-D. L. Page, Oxford 1955.
Menander, *Sam.* C. Austin, Berlin 1969-1970.
Philodamus, *Paean in Dionysum*: J. U. Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina, Oxford 1928; B. Rainer, Diss. Urbana, Illinois 1975.
Pindarus, *Epinicia*, B. Snell-H. Maehler, Leipzig 1971; *Fr.* B. Snell, Leipzig ^{3}1964.
Plato, *Euthphr.* J. Burnet, Oxford 1924. *Resp.* J. Adam, Cambridge 1905-1907.
Sophocles, R. C. Jebb, Cambridge 1883-1908. *El.* G. Kaibel, Leipzig 1896. *Fr.* A. Nauck (TGF); A. C. Pearson, Cambridge 1917; S. Radt, Göttingen 1977 (TrGF-the numbering of the fragments is Pearson's).

Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TGF): A. Nauck, Leipzig ²1889.
Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (TrGF): vol 1. Didascaliae tragicae, catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum, B. Snell. Göttingen 1971. vol. 4: see Sophocles.

(b) *Other literature*

J. T. Allen and G. Italie, A Concordance to Euripides, Berkeley-London 1954, repr. Groningen 1970. [see also C. Collard.]
Marylin Arthur, The choral odes of the Bacchae of Euripides. In: Adam Parry ed., Yale Classical Studies 22. Cambridge 1972, 145-179.
David Bain, Actors and Audience. A study of asides and related conventions in Greek drama. Oxford 1977.
Bernard Beckerman, Dynamics of Drama. Theory and method of analysis. New York 1970.
Vincenzo Di Benedetto, Euripide: teatro e società. Turin 1971.
E. K. Borthwick, Three notes on Euripides' Bacchae, CR 16 (1966) 136-138.
W. Brashear, Euripides' Bacchae 17-26 [P. Berol. Inv. 21235], ZPE 19 (1975) 300-301.
Wilhelm Breitenbach, Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik. Stuttgart 1934, repr. Hildesheim 1967.
J. M. Bremer, Hamartia. Tragic Error in the Poetics of Aristotle and in Greek Tragedy. Amsterdam 1969.
——, Why Messenger-speeches? In: J. M. Bremer, S. L. Radt, C. J. Ruijgh edd., Miscellanea Tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek. Amsterdam 1976, 29-48.
——, De interpretatie van Euripides' Bacchen. Een historisch overzicht, Lampas 9 (1976) 2-7.
H. D. Broadhead, Tragica. Elucidations of passages in Greek tragedy. Christchurch 1968.
Anne Pippin Burnett, Pentheus and Dionysus: Host and Guest, CPh 65 (1970) 15-29.
——, Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal. Oxford 1971.
A. Y. Campbell, Notes on Euripides' Bacchae, CQ 6 (1956) 56-67.
Raffaele Cantarella, Dioniso fra Baccanti e Rane. In: John L. Heller and J. K. Newman edd., Serta Turyniana. Studies in Greek Literature and Palaeography in honor of Alexander Turyn. Urbana-Chicago-London 1974, 291-310.
Jean Carrière, Sur le message des Bacchantes, AC 35 (1966) 118-139.
Victor Castellani, That troubled house of Pentheus in Euripides' Bacchae, TAPhA 106 (1976) 61-83.
Pierre Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots. Paris 1968-1980.
Fernand Chapouthier, Euripide et l'accueil du divin. In: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 1: La notion du divin depuis Homère jusqu'à Platon, Fondations Hardt, Geneva 1954, 205-237.
C. Collard, Supplement to the Allen-Italie Concordance to Euripides, Groningen 1971.
D. J. Conacher, Euripidean Drama, Myth, Theme and Structure, Toronto-London 1967.
N. C. Conomis, The Dochmiacs of Greek Drama, Hermes 92 (1964) 23-50.
A. M. Dale, The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama, Cambridge ²1968.
——, Collected Papers, Cambridge 1969.
Karl Deichgräber, Die Kadmos-Teiresiasszene in Euripides' Bakchen, Hermes 70 (1935) 322-349.
——, Die Lykurgie des Aischylos, Versuch einer Wiederherstellung der dionysischen Tetralogie. Gött. Nachr. 1939 (3.8.)
J. D. Denniston, The Greek Particles. Oxford ²1954.
Ludwig Deubner, Attische Feste. Berlin 1932, repr. Darmstadt 1962.
Hans Diller, Die Bakchen und ihre Stellung im Spätwerk des Euripides, Abh. Akad. Mainz 1955 (5) 453-471, also in: E.-R. Schwinge ed., Euripides, 469-492.

Joachim Dingel, Requisit und szenisches Bild in der griechischen Tragödie. In: W. Jens ed., Bauformen 347-367.
P. Dobree, Adversaria. Ed. J. Scholefield, Cambridge 1833; W. Wagner, Berlin 1875.
E. R. Dodds, Euripides the Irrationalist, CR 43 (1929) 97-104.
——, The Greeks and the Irrational. Berkeley-Los Angeles 1951.
Bruce E. Donovan, Euripides Papyri I: Texts from Oxyrhynchus. New Haven and Toronto 1969.
K. J. Dover, Aristophanic Comedy. London 1972.
Victor Ehrenberg, The people of Aristophanes, A sociology of Old Attic Comedy. Oxford 1943, repr. London 1974.
F. Ferrari, La perodo delle Baccanti: moduli e composizione, Quaderni Urbinati 32 (1979) 69-79.
A. J. Festugière, La signification religieuse de la Parodos des Bacchantes, Eranos 54 (1956) 72-86.
——, Euripide dans les Bacchantes, Eranos 55 (1957) 127-144.
H. Fors, Dionysos und die Stärke des Schwachen im Werk des Euripides. Diss. Tübingen 1964.
Hermann Fraenkel, Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Munich ²1962.
Hjalmar Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Heidelberg 1960-1972.
Barbara K. Gold, ΕΥΚΟΣΜΙΑ in Euripides' Bacchae, AJPh 98 (1977) 3-15.
William Watson Goodwin, Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. London ²1889, repr. London 1965.
L. H. G. Greenwood, Aspects of Euripidean Tragedy. Cambridge 1953, repr. New York 1972.
M. Gronewald, Euripides, Bakchen 294, ZPE 19 (1975) 304.
B. A. van Groningen, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ. De alleenheerscher op het tragische tooneel der Grieken. Med.Ned.Akad.Wet. 1941 (4.12.) 475-566.
George Maximilian Antony Grube, Dionysus in the Bacchae, TAPhA 66 (1935) 37-54.
——, The Drama of Euripides. New York 1941, repr. London-New York 1961.
J.-P. Guépin, The Tragic Paradox, Myth and Ritual in Greek Tragedy. Amsterdam 1968.
Richard Hamilton, Bacchae 47-52: Dionysus' Plan, TAPhA 104 (1974) 139-149.
Jeffrey Henderson, The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy. New Haven and London 1975.
N. C. Hourmouziades, Production and imagination in Euripides. Form and function of the scenic space. Athens 1965.
John Jackson, Marginalia Scaenica. Oxford 1955.
F. Jacobs, Exercitationes in scriptores veteres I: Curae secundae in Euripidis tragoedias. Leipzig 1796.
Siegfried Jäkel, Wahrheit und Trug in den Dramen des Euripides, Arctos 11 (1977) 15-40.
Hans Robert Jauss, Literaturgeschichte als Provokation, Frankfurt 1970.
Walter Jens ed., Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie. Munich 1971.
Klaus Joerden, Hinterszenischer Raum und ausserszenische Zeit. Untersuchungen zur dramatischen Technik der griechischen Tragödie. Diss. (masch.) Tübingen 1960.
——, Zur Bedeutung des ausser- und hinterszenischen. In: W. Jens ed., Bauformen, 369-412.
J. C. Kamerbeek, Euripides en het Probleem der Bacchen. In: W. Vollgraff e.a., De Antieke Tragedie. Lectures given at the Conference on Classical Studies, 22-27 July 1946. Leiden 1947, 96-121.
——, On the conception of ΘΕΟΜΑΧΟΣ in relation with Greek tragedy, Mnem. IV.1 (1948) 271-283.
——, Deux passages des Bacchantes d'Euripide, Mnem. IV.6 (1953) 192-197.
R. Kassel, Euripides Bakchen 23, ZPE 21 (1976) 35-36.
H. D. F. Kitto, Greek Tragedy. A Literary Study. London ³1961.

L. Koenen, Euripides, Bakchen 650-656, ZPE 6 (1970) 150-151.

———, Euripides, Bakchen 756 f., ZPE 6 (1970) 38.

Walther Kranz, Stasimon. Untersuchungen zu Form und Gehalt der griechischen Tragödie. Berlin 1933.

Gerd Kremer, Die Struktur des Tragödienschlusses. In: W. Jens ed., Bauformen, 117-141.

Raphael Kühner-Bernhard Gerth, Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Satzlehre. Hanover ^{3}1898-1904, repr. Leverkusen 1955.

J. I. M. van der Kun, Handelingsaspecten in het drama. Nijmegen 1938, repr. Amsterdam 1970.

Jene A. Larue, Prurience uncovered: The psychology of Euripides' Pentheus, CJ 63 (1967-68) 210-214.

Joachim Latacz, Zum Wortfeld „Freude" in der Sprache Homers. Heidelberg 1966.

Richmond Lattimore, Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy. London 1964.

Albin Lesky, Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen. Göttingen 1956, ^{3}1972.

———, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Berne-Munich ^{2}1963.

———, Psychologie bei Euripides. In: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 6: Euripide. Fondation Hardt, Geneva 1960, 125-150. Also in: E.-R. Schwinge ed., Euripides, 79-101.

Harry L. Levy, Euripides, Bacchae 1167, Mnem. IV.26 (1973) 282-284.

Herman van Looy, Zes verloren tragedies van Euripides. Verh. Kon. Vlaamse Akad. Wet. 1964 (26.51.), Brussels.

Brigitte Mannsperger, Die Rhesis. In: W. Jens ed., Bauformen, 143-181.

Paul Masqueray, Euripide et ses idées. Paris 1908.

R. Merkelbach, Zwei Euripidesinterpolationen, RhM 97 (1954) 373-375.

Harald Merklin, Gott und Mensch im Hippolytos und den Bakchen des Euripides. Diss. Freiburg im Breisgau 1964.

C. Middendorf, Observationes in Euripidis Bacchas. Münster 1867.

Gilbert Murray, The Bacchae [of Euripides] in relation to certain currents of thought in the fifth century. In: Essays and Addresses, London 1921, 56-87.

———, Euripides and his age. London no date.

Martin P. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion. I: Die Religion Griechenlands bis auf die griechische Weltherrschaft. [quoted as GGR I] Munich ^{3}1967.

———, Greek Popular Religion. New York 1940.

Gilbert Norwood, The Riddle of the Bacchae. Manchester 1908.

———, Essays on Euripidean Drama. London 1954.

K. O'Nolan, A note on the Bacchae, CR 8 (1958) 204-206.

Hans Oranje, Een theorie van de handelingsaspecten in het drama, Lampas 8 (1975) 237-247.

E. Pax, Epiphanie. In: Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum (Stuttgart 1950-), 5 (1961) 832-909.

F. Pfister, Epiphanie. In: RE Suppl. IV (1924) 277-323.

Manfred Pfister, Das Drama. Theorie und Analyse. Munich 1977.

H. Philippart, Iconographie des Bacchantes d'Euripide, Revue Belge de Philosophie et d'Histoire 9 (1930) 5-72.

A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens. Oxford 1946.

———, The Dramatic Festivals of Athens. Second edition revised by John Gould and D. M. Lewis. Oxford 1968.

———, Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy. Second edition revised by T. B. L. Webster. Oxford 1962.

Ioannes Pierson, Verisimilium libri duo. Leiden 1752.

J. Th. M. F. Pieters, Motieven en patronen in de koorliederen van de Bacchae, Lampas 9 (1976) 78-94.

Max Pohlenz, Die griechische Tragödie. Leipzig 1930, Göttingen ^{2}1954.

Hansjürgen Popp, Das Amoibaion. In: W. Jens ed., Bauformen, 221-275.

G. A. Privitera, Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia greca arcaica. Rome 1970.

J. H. Quincey, Greek Expressions of Thanks, JHS 86 (1966) 133-158.
Johann Jakob Reiske, Ad Euripidem et Aristophanem animadversiones. Leipzig 1754.
André Rivier, Essai sur le tragique d'Euripide. Lausanne 1944. Paris [2]1975.
Jürgen Rode, Das Chorlied. In: W. Jens ed., Bauformen, 85-115.
Jacqueline de Romilly, Le thème du bonheur dans les Bacchantes, REG 76 (1963) 361-380.
Thomas G. Rosenmeyer, The Masks of Tragedy. Austin 1963. [Chapter on Tragedy and Religion: The Bacchae, also in Erich Segal ed., Euripides. A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs N.J. 1968, 150-170 (slightly abridged by permission of the author).]
Jeanne Roux, A propos du décor dans les tragédies d'Euripide, REG 74 (1961) 25-60.
——, Sur la parodos des Bacchantes, REG 75 (1962) 64-71.
William Sale, The psychoanalysis of Pentheus in the Bacchae of Euripides. In: Adam Parry ed., Yale Classical Studies 22, Cambridge 1972, 63-82.
Otto Schroeder, Euripidis Cantica, Leipzig [2]1928.
Ernst-Richard Schwinge, Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides. Heidelberg 1968.
——, ed., Euripides (Wege der Forschung 89). Darmstadt 1968.
William C. Scott, Two suns over Thebes: imagery and stage effects in the Bacchae, TAPhA 105 (1975) 333-346.
Louis Séchan, Études sur la Tragédie Grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique, Paris 1926, repr. 1967.
Charles Segal, Euripides' Bacchae: Conflict and Mediation, Ramus 6 (1977) 103-120.
——, Sex roles and reversals in Euripides' Bacchae, Arethusa 11 (1978) 185-202.
Bernd Seidensticker, Pentheus, Poetica 5 (1972) 35-63.
August Seidler, De versibus dochmiacis tragicorum Graecorum. Leipzig 1811-1812.
Ioannes Smereka, Studia Euripidea. I: De sermone, de vocabulorum copia. Lwow 1936. II.1: De elocutionis consuetudinibus. Lwow 1937.
Friedrich Solmsen, Zur Gestaltung des Intriguenmotivs in den Tragödien des Sophokles und Euripides, Philologus 87 (1932) 1-17. Also in E.-R. Schwinge ed., Euripides, 326-344.
Anna Spitzbarth, Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechischen Tragödie. Zürich 1946.
P. T. Stevens, Colloquial Expressions in Euripides. Wiesbaden 1976.
Hans Strohm, Trug und Täuschung in der euripideischen Dramatik, Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft 4 (1949-50) 140-156. Also in: E.-R. Schwinge ed., Euripides, 345-372.
——, Euripides. Interpretation zur dramatischen Form. Munich 1957.
J. L.Styan, The Elements of Drama. Cambridge 1963.
Oliver Taplin, The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. Oxford 1977.
George Thomson, Aeschylus and Athens. A study in the social origins of drama. London [3]1966.
Max Treu, Von Homer zur Lyrik. Munich 1955.
W. J. Verdenius, Notes on Euripides' Bacchae, Mnem. IV.15 (1962) 337-363.
——, Notes on the Parodos of Euripides' Bacchae, Mnem. IV.34 (1981), 300-315.
A. W. Verrall, The Bacchants of Euripides and other essays. Cambridge 1910.
H. S. Versnel, ΙΑΚΧΟΣ, Talanta 4 (1972) 23-38.
——, Pentheus en Dionysus. Religieuze achtergronden en perspectieven, Lampas 9 (1976) 8-41.
G. J. de Vries, Remarks on a Greek form of address (ὦ τᾶν), Mnem. IV.19 (1966) 225-230.
Felix Wassermann, Die Bakchantinnen des Euripides, Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung 5 (1929) 272-286.
——, Man and God in the Bacchae and in the Oedipus at Colonus, In: G. E. Mylonas and D. Raymond edd., Studies presented to D. M. Robinson II, Saint Louis 1953, 559-569.

T. B. L. Webster, The Tragedies of Euripides. London 1967.
Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Analecta Euripidea. Berlin 1875, repr. Hildesheim 1963.
——, Parergon 23, Hermes 14 (1879) 179, Also in: Kleine Schriften IV, Berlin 1962, 15.
——, Aischylos Interpretationen. Berlin 1914.
——, Griechische Verskunst. [quoted as *Versk.*] Berlin 1921, repr. Darmstadt 1958.
——, Der Glaube der Hellenen. Berlin 1931-1932, repr. Darmstadt 1959.
C. W. Willink, Some problems of text and interpretation in the Bacchae. I, CQ 16 (1966) 27-50; II, CQ 16 (1966) 220-242, 347.
R. P. Winnington-Ingram, Euripides and Dionysus. An Interpretation of the Bacchae. Cambridge 1948, repr. Amsterdam 1969.
——, Euripides, Bacchae 877-881 = 897-901, BICS 13 (1966) 34-37.
Irena Zawadzka, ΤΟΛΜΑ, Eos 54 (1964) 44-55.
Thaddaeus Zielinski, Tragodumenon libri tres. Cracow 1925.
W. Zürcher, Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides. Basle 1947.
G. Zuntz, An inquiry into the transmission of the plays of Euripides. Cambridge 1965.

INDEXES

Figures marked with an asterisk (*) refer to the notes

(i) *Greek*

ἅ 203*
ἁβρός 141*, 153*, 92
ἀγχόνη 106*
ἀγών 91 f., 225*, 226*, 228*, 137 f., 333*
αἰθήρ 47 f., 119*, 65
αἱμάσσω 184, 393*, 398*
αἰνέω 220*
αἰσχρός 96, 172, 175
ἀλήθεια 172
ἀμαθής 58, 151*, 70, 74, 226*, 174
ἁμαρτία 78*, 96, 235*
ἀναγκάζω 144*
ἄξιος 190*, 92, 228*
ἀριθμός 97
ἀσεβής 151*, 155*, 70, 74
Βακχεύς 189, 405*, 406*
βάκχευσις 125*
βάρβαρος 99*, 58
βραχὺς αἰών 268*
Βρόμιος 189, 405*
γάνος 108*, 327*
γελάω 43, 107*, 54, 86, 215*, 122, 327*, 151, 155
γέρων, γῆρας 39, 96*, 149 f.
δαίς 108*, 267*
δίκη, δίκαιος 96, 103 ff., 254*, 106, 267*, 268*, 162 ff., 168 ff., 172
δόλος, δόλιος 32 f., 59, 151*, 70, 78, 194*, 81, 221*, 229*, 128, 133
δόξα 172
δουλεύω 40, 99*, 175
εἰσβιβάζω 56, 143*, 144*
ἔλεος 25, 63*, 93, 97, 239*, 113, 169
ἐναργής 120, 302*
ἐξομόργνυμι 113*
ἐπιτήδειος 158*
ἐρημία 147
εὐτυχία 33, 84*
εὐφροσύνη 120*, 83, 101 ff., 251 ff.*
ἡδονή 24, 63*, 169 f.
ἡδύς 189, 403*
ἦθος 20 f., 26, 163*, 176 f.
ἡσυχία 106 ff., 269*, 174
θεομάχος 37, 91*, 69 f., 76 f., 81
θεραπεύω 40, 99*
θήρ, θηράω 24, 127 f., 136, 141 f., 342*, 165 f., 391*
θνητὰ φρονεῖν 106 ff., 268*, 162
θρασύς 59 f., 151*, 70, 78
Ἴακχος 278*, 132
ἴδοις ἄν 200*, 84, 212*, 327*
ἱερά 148*
ἴσθι 196*
καί 'and therefore' 111*
καὶ μήν adversative 196*
καλός, τὸ καλόν 33, 111*, 47, 53 f., 71, 208*, 137, 332*, 164 ff., 171 f., 178 ff.
κῶμος 225*, 138, 334*
μαίνομαι, μανία 35 f., 127*, 76, 80 ff., 214*, 89 ff., 234*, 236*, 107, 112 f., 310*, 126, 130, 142, 163, 165, 171 f.
μανθάνω 35 f., 37, 179*, 234*, 138 f.
μηχάνημα 32 f., 75 f., 191*, 192*, 80 ff., 204*, 229*, 97, 128 f., 133, 173 f.
νεανίας 54, 137*, 228*, 122, 126
νόμος 45, 148*
νόσος 96, 233*
νυν after the imperative 84
οἶνος παυσίλυπος 95*, 101 ff., 174
ὄνομα - πρᾶγμα 171 ff.
ὄργια 108*, 109 ff., 278*
ὀρθῶς 86, 210*, 88
περιβάλλω 332*
πικρός 125*, 173*
πίπτω 84, 327*, 139 f., 175, 188
πιστός 230*, 332*
πόθος 53 f.
ποτνιάδες 390*, 394*
προτείνω 104*
σαθρός 59, 150*, 151*
σεμνότης 59, 149*
σοφία, τὸ σοφόν, σοφός 2, 40, 98*, 110*, 71, 72, 76, 187*, 81, 105 ff., 268*, 270*, 112 f., 129 f., 159 ff.
σοφίσματα (Κάδμου) 41, 57, 60, 75, 167 f.
σπαραγμός 119*, 73, 94 f., 97, 110 ff., 135, 136 ff., 182
σωτηρία 33, 84*, 78 f., 92 f., 226*, 228*
τελεταί 55 ff.
τέλος 33, 97*, 216*, 172
τέχναι 78 f., 128, 133
τί δὴ τόδε 206*
τίνω 156*
τόδ' ἄλλο 107*
τόλμα 92

ὕβρις 60, 62, 159*, 74, 96 104 f., 172
φαλλοφορία 103, 250*
φαρμακός 91
φαῦλος 107, 109, 162, 164, 174
φθόνος 108 f., 165 f., 380*
φόβος 25, 63*, 93, 97, 239*, 113, 169
φύλαξ 222*, 92
ὠμοφαγία 73, 110 ff., 135, 136, 183, 393*, 394*
ὦ τᾶν 192*

(ii) textual criticism and metrical problems in the *Bacchae*

20-22	85*	571-75	340*
23	85*, 86*	576-603	337*
35	90*	636	279*
53-54	92*	651-52	App. 2
72	409*	756-761	App. 3
105	409*	787	188*
123-25	409*	796	190*
135-169	App. 4	808	196*
182	97*	813	202*
209	237*	814	204*
246	106*	837	209*
261	108*	842-43	85-88
263	109*	860	216*
292-94	119*	877 ~ 897	162
315-16	122*	1005-010	165 f., 381*
335	111*	1060	233*
395-99	268*	1091-92	230*
406	350*	1098	230*
427	270*	1104[a]	230*
449	126*	1108-09	230*
451	127*	1113	230*
466	142*	1153-164	332*
468	145*	1167	334*
484	148*	1168	375*
506	156*	P. Ant. 24 fr. 2[a]	196*